

Mr. GRONNA (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to inquire if the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] has voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SHIELDS entered the Chamber and voted "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (after having voted in the negative). The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] having voted, I withdraw my vote and announce my pair.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—43.

Ashurst	James	Perkins	Stone
Borah	Kenyon	Polindexter	Sutherland
Brady	Kern	Ransdell	Thomas
Brandeggee	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Thompson
Burton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Thornton
Camden	Lewis	Sheppard	Vardaman
Cañon	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Weeks
Chilton	Newlands	Shively	West
Crawford	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	White
Gronna	Overman	Smith, Ga.	Works
Hollis	Page	Smoot	

NAYS—6.

Bankhead	Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Nelson
Bryan	Jones		

NOT VOTING—47.

Bristow	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Md.
Burleigh	Goff	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Gore	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Clapp	Hitchcock	Owen	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Hughes	Penrose	Sterling
Cott	Johnson	Pittman	Swanson
Culbertson	La Follette	Pomerene	Tillman
Cummins	Lippitt	Reed	Townsend
Dillingham	Lodge	Robinson	Walsh
du Pont	McCumber	Root	Warren
Fall	McLean	Sherman	Williams
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Simmons	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15613) to create an interstate trade commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

Mr. BORAH rose.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Does the Senator from Idaho wish to proceed with his remarks now, or will he prefer that we should consider amendments?

Mr. BORAH. It is immaterial to me. If the Senator from Nevada prefers to proceed with the bill and consider amendments, I will make my remarks later. I will be at the convenience of the chairman.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to have one amendment considered, but as the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is not here—

Mr. KENYON. The senior Senator from Iowa is on his way here from his office.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will await the coming of the Senator from Iowa. The Senator from Idaho can proceed.

Mr. BORAH. I will ask the chairman, then, to entertain the Senate while he is waiting, because I do not want to begin my speech and then stop.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not understand the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. BORAH. I said I do not desire to begin my remarks and then cease as soon as the Senator from Iowa comes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will not interrupt the Senator, of course. The Senator can proceed.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I should be very glad to occupy the time until the Senator from Iowa gets here, if it is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I am prepared to go ahead, unless the Senator from Nevada desires to take up the bill and proceed with the amendments, and so forth. If general discussion is now to be had, I am prepared to proceed. Otherwise, I will give way, if the Senator from Nevada wants to take up the bill for action on amendments when the Senator from Iowa returns to the Chamber.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I hope the Senator from Idaho will proceed.

[Mr. BORAH addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Idaho if it will be convenient for him to suspend his remarks for a motion to adjourn?

Mr. BORAH. I shall be very glad to suspend.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 23, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, July 22, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our hearts turn to Thee, Eternal God, our heavenly Father, for a renewal of our faith, hope, and confidence in Thine almightiness, that we may bend our wills to Thine, put our souls into our work, assured that Thy providence shall shape it to Thy purposes, thus making us instruments in Thy hands for the furtherance of Thy plans.

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsels of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful: But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in His law doth he meditate day and night. And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." So may we live, work, and prosper. In the spirit of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXPOSITION AT SAN FRANCISCO.

The SPEAKER. With the indulgence of the House, the Chair wishes to make a statement in respect to the vote taken yesterday on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment in respect to a Government building at the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco was concurred in, and to lay that motion on the table. The vote should have been taken first on the motion to lay on the table, but, as a matter of fact, it was taken on the motion to reconsider. Ordinarily it would suggest itself immediately to the Chair or to anyone else. For instance, if A made the motion to reconsider and B made the motion to lay on the table, of course the vote on the last motion would be taken first; but owing to the confusion yesterday the vote was taken first on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MANN. There were two motions?

The SPEAKER. Yes; and the same Member made both of them, but in the confusion, after the severance was ordered, the vote was taken on the motion to reconsider.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state the reason why I make this request. To-morrow, in addition to considering the sundry civil appropriation bill, there is a conference report on the general deficiency bill to be considered, with one item undisposed of. If we meet at 11 o'clock it will enable the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to leave the city on a very important matter; otherwise these bills must necessarily go over until next week.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will withhold my objection for a moment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Senator MARTIN of Virginia is required to leave the city to-morrow at 3 o'clock because of family reasons. If we can meet at 11 o'clock, we can probably have action on both of these reports, and be able to dispose of whatever additional conference is necessary before he is compelled to leave the city; otherwise it may be necessary that these bills go over until next week.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I feel very much inclined, in view of what took place here yesterday afternoon, to object, and I would do so if it were not for the special reason which the gentleman from New York gives. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] objects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Both gentlemen withdraw their objections. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

USE OF REVENUE CUTTERS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes in reply to the letter from Secretary McAdoo in respect to the use of revenue cutters.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MURDOCK. Who objected?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR].

Mr. MURDOCK. Can a gentleman object while he keeps his seat?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York got about half way up. [Laughter].

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects. Of course the point of order made by the gentleman from Kansas is well taken. A Member can not from his seat make objection, but as a matter of fact the gentleman from New York had gotten half way up.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, it has just been explained to me that there is some criticism in the letter of Secretary McAdoo of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], and I withdraw my objection.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, we will end this matter right here. I object, and I am going to stick to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

ELLEN M. STONE RANSOM FUND.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, in view of these rapid-fire objections on both sides of the Chamber, I have not the temerity to undertake to ask any indulgence of the House in taking time to address it at this time, especially upon this sacred day of Calendar Wednesday; but I would like to have unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and it will be the second time during my entire service in this House that I have ever asked that privilege. In order that the House may know upon what subject I wish to extend my remarks, I wish to say that it is not only in keeping a promise I made to one who represents many others who are interested in this proposed legislation, but in its observance there is a good deal of pleasure upon my part. I want to get the matter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow for another reason, because there are at least 40 per cent of new membership in the personnel of the House as compared with that of the last Congress; and, if I may carry the comparison further, I might say that during my service, involving almost six years, there has been such a change in the personnel of the House that only about one-third of the Members of the present Congress were Members of the Sixty-first Congress. It is because the subject, on that account, is quite new to so many Members of the House that I want briefly to say that, while it is in behalf and support of a measure that has four times passed the Senate, yet it has never been in any way more than merely mentioned on this floor, though at least once being favorably reported out by the Committee on Claims. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the reimbursement to the contributors to the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund. I do not know how many here are familiar with that case, now almost ancient history, the stirring scenes of which were laid in Macedonia over a dozen years ago; but involving, as it does, a question that, it seems to me, is very close to our national honor, favorable action on which has been recommended by three distinguished Secretaries of State under three different administrations, and which, as I have said, has four times passed the Senate. I wish, therefore, to have an opportunity to include in the Record in extension of my remarks matter that shall set forth some of the documents, reports, and other facts bearing upon that particular case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like simply to make this remark: I do not always approve of the appointments made by the President of the United States, or probably those of any other President since I have been here; but I think we, all of us, can compliment and congratulate the President upon the selection from this House of one of its ablest Members to represent this country in France. [Applause.] While we shall miss him here, we know that the country will be represented to its full height abroad while the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] represents us as our ambassador to France. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP]?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to object, but I should like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP], in view of the fact that he will soon separate himself from this House, where we have enjoyed and appreciated him, shall have 10 minutes in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] have 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Ohio does not want the time.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman from Ohio does not want the time—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman from Ohio expected to ask the House to be permitted to make this address as a sort of valedictory, and he was somewhat—

Mr. BUTLER. Embarrassed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Somewhat diffident about doing so, in view of the objection which was made to another request. I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] is about to quit the House, and I hope the House will not object to his making a final speech.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman desires to address the House, I have no objection whatever, but I am sure the gentleman from Ohio would not desire to address the House for only 10 minutes on the Ellen M. Stone proposition. Before the matter came up he informed me that he desired to extend his remarks in the Record on that subject. I should be very glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio be given 10 minutes in which to address the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, thanking the gentlemen from New York and Pennsylvania very sincerely for their kindness and courtesy, the gentleman from Illinois is entirely right. I do not want any time in which to address the House upon this matter. The House has already been very generous to me in giving me this opportunity to extend my remarks in the Record; but I certainly would appreciate about two minutes time in which to thank not only the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for his very kind and gracious words, but also the entire membership of this House for the many courtesies that they have uniformly extended to me. The pleasant associations made on both sides of the dividing aisle during my service here will always be the happiest within my memory. Just before coming in here I was telling the distinguished Speaker, in his room, that the longer I remained a Member of this House the more I was impressed with the valuable and life-long lessons that such an association brings to a Member. It broadens his views of good citizenship and, above everything else, brightens within his heart the fires of a patriotic love of his country. I do not know that I can carry away with me a scene more inspiring than that when, on occasions, I have walked through the long corridor and looked across the rotunda from the Senate side and on down the long vista, extending beyond to the portal of this Chamber, and saw at the far end the American flag above the Speaker's desk, and then just below it the imposing figure of one whom we all honor and respect, a man who embodies in his sterling qualities of character and intellect the highest conception of American citizenship. [Applause.] And if I may add to the picture that other inspiring sight, a scene which I do not think is duplicated in any other legislative assembly on the face of the earth—the magnificent portrait of George Washington, the Father of his Country, at the Speaker's right, and there on his left that other compatriot, Lafayette, symbolical of the long friendship that has existed between the peoples of these two great Republics. [Applause.] I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, not having in mind the purpose of reviewing at any length the circumstances surrounding the capture by Turkish brigands of Miss Stone, her long imprisonment by them, and her final release, I shall content myself with merely setting forth those facts, now largely a matter of official record, which to my mind clearly demand favorable action upon the bill providing for reimbursement to the contributors to the ransom fund by the payment of which she was finally released. Indeed, though more than 12 years have elapsed since the harrowing experiences of this devoted woman occurred, yet we must all vividly recall the main incidents connected with her capture and final release, for the whole case was of such a sensational nature as to attract the attention of the people of every civilized nation; particularly was this true of our own people. It was this widespread sympathy and concern for her safety that undoubtedly led Mr. Hay, then Secretary of State, to telegraph under date of October 3, 1901, to the Rev. Judson Smith, of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at Boston, as follows:

It seems imperative that the amount (of the ransom) should be raised or pledged, so as to be available by your treasurer at Constantinople in season to save Miss Stone. Statutory prohibitions make it impossible for this Government to advance the money or guarantee its payment.

If paid by Miss Stone's friends, every effort will be made to obtain reimbursement from whichever Government may be found responsible under international law and precedent. In the event of its proving impossible to hold any foreign Government responsible for the capture and to secure the repayment of the money, this Government is willing in the last resort to urge upon Congress as strongly as possible to appropriate money to repay the missionaries.

While in fairness to those who may claim that the contributions to the fund for Miss Stone's release were entirely voluntary and were not made with the hope of return upon the strength of this telegram, yet it is, to say the least, a matter of marked coincidence that within a very few days after its wide publication throughout the country contributions came pouring in during the following two weeks. A list of such contributors shows that upward of 2,200 generously responded, sending all the way from a few cents up to \$5,000 each, aggregating a total of approximately \$75,000. Though naturally a considerable bulk of the sum total of contributions came from Boston and vicinity, yet in looking over the list I find that nearly every State in the Union was represented by some of those contributors. All of this money up to the amount agreed upon was quickly sent over to the brigands as a ransom for Miss Stone's release.

Congress, not being in session at the time, could not be appealed to to authorize an appropriation for the payment of this ransom, even if inclined so to do. While undoubtedly Secretary Hay had in mind at the time some recourse for its ultimate payment by the Turkish Government, yet for reasons evidently satisfactory to him and to his successor in office, these claims were never pressed to a successful conclusion. The matter therefore rests, it seems to me, entirely with the American Congress to afford the relief which the State Department unequivocally at the time stated it would be urged to do in the last sentence of the telegram which I have quoted.

More than six years elapsed after the sending of this telegram before any official action was taken by our Government looking to the acknowledgment of its liability on account of the obligation assumed by the promises therein contained. On the 21st day of March, 1908, President Roosevelt sent to the Senate the following message:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a letter from the Secretary of State on the subject of the repayment to the contributors of the money raised to pay the ransom for the release of Miss Ellen M. Stone, an American missionary to Turkey, who was abducted by brigands on September 3, 1901, while traveling on the highway from Raslog to Djumabala in the Turkish Empire.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 26, 1908.

The letter of Secretary Root, which was transmitted by President Roosevelt, reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 24, 1908.

THE PRESIDENT:

As will be remembered, Miss Ellen M. Stone, an American missionary to Turkey, was abducted by brigands on September 3, 1901, while traveling on the highway from Raslog to Djumabala in the Turkish Empire.

Our diplomatic and consular representatives in Turkey, in correspondence with the Department of State, shortly after the capture, indicated their belief that the motive therefor was to obtain a ransom, and stated that they had requested the Turkish officials to abstain from too close pursuit of the brigands, lest the death of the captured might result.

From later correspondence with our representatives it appeared that the brigands had retired to the mountains with the captive, probably over the border into Bulgaria. The exact location of the party during the captivity, however, is not established by any evidence in the possession of the Department of State, nor does it appear clearly of what Government the bandits were subjects.

About October 1, 1901, the bandits opened negotiations for a ransom, demanding \$25,000, and transmitting a letter from Miss Stone, asking that the sum demanded be paid and that pursuit of the brigands by the Turkish troops be stopped.

Our diplomatic representatives were of the opinion that Miss Stone's release could only be obtained by the payment of the ransom, and the State Department shared this view. Miss Stone's friends, of course, entered into correspondence with the department regarding the payment of the ransom, and were told that it must be raised by private means.

On October 3, 1901, the State Department telegraphed to the Rev. Judson Smith, of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Boston, Mass., as follows:

"It seems imperative that the amount (of the ransom) should be raised or pledged, so as to be available by your treasurer at Constantinople in season to save Miss Stone. Statutory provisions make it impossible for this Government to advance the money or guarantee its payment. If paid by Miss Stone's friends, every effort will be made to obtain reimbursement from whichever Government may be found responsible under international law and precedent. In the event of its proving impossible to hold any foreign Government responsible for the capture and to secure the repayment of the money, this Government is willing in the last resort to urge upon Congress as strongly as possible to appropriate money to repay the contributors."

It is claimed that this assurance given by the department in its dispatch to Mr. Smith, to the effect that, as a last resort, a recommendation would be made to Congress looking toward the appropriation of a sum sufficient to pay the donors, was largely instrumental in enabling Miss Stone's friends to secure the sum of \$66,000, which was raised through public subscription in this country by October 23, 1901, for the purpose of effecting Miss Stone's release.

After negotiations of considerable length the brigands finally consented to accept the amount raised, and arrangements were made by

United States Minister Leishman for the payment of the money at a point near Bansko, Macedonia, the Turkish authorities consenting to withhold their troops from the vicinity of the place in order that the negotiations might have a successful issue.

The release of the captive was not obtained so soon as expected, but was finally reported by Minister Leishman on February 23, 1902.

After careful consideration of all the facts my predecessor, Mr. Hay, decided on January 19, 1905, that it was not advisable to attempt to hold the Turkish Government responsible for the capture and to secure the repayment of the money. Upon the subsequent application for reconsideration of this decision Mr. Hay again, on April 11, 1905, reaffirmed the judgment which he had originally expressed. Upon a further review of the same subject I have come to the conclusion that it is not advisable to reverse or change the conclusion which Mr. Hay reached.

It would seem, therefore, that the executive department is bound to make good its promise to recommend to Congress that money be appropriated to repay the ransom money, a promise which was probably relied upon by many of those who contributed of their private means to save the life of an American citizen believed to be in the gravest peril.

Accordingly I have the honor to advise that Congress be recommended to appropriate an amount sufficient to repay the contributors.

Respectfully submitted,

ELIHU ROOT.

As a result of this renewed agitation a bill providing an appropriation sufficient to reimburse all the contributors to Miss Stone's ransom fund was passed by the Senate in the Sixtieth, Sixty-first, Sixty-second, and the Sixty-third Congresses. More than this, a similar bill was favorably reported out by the House Committee on Claims by Chairman Prince, which set forth at some length the reasons that justified that committee in making a favorable report. That report in part reads as follows:

The committee has carefully gone over this case, and find that Ellen M. Stone, an American missionary to Turkey, was abducted by brigands on September 3, 1901, while traveling on the highway from Raslog to Djumabala, in the Turkish Empire. Friends contributed for her ransom, and were led to believe by correspondence with the State Department that the ransom money so contributed would be returned, either by obtaining it from Turkey or from the Treasury of the United States.

Messrs. Kidder, Peabody & Co., bankers, Boston, Mass., became the custodians of this fund, and furnished to the committee a list of the names and addresses of the original givers or their accredited representatives.

The committee finds that there are 2,264 givers to this fund.

Hereto attached and made a part of this report is a message from former President Roosevelt and former Secretary of State ELIHU ROOT and the list of the contributors.

The committee insists that the amount favored by them, of \$66,000, shall be in full of all claims of every kind and character, and so accepted by the contributors who receive the money from the Secretary of the Treasury under the provisions of this bill.

The committee desires this appropriation of \$66,000 to make an end to all legislation desired by the contributors to the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund.

Unfortunately the parliamentary status of the House bill became such that its consideration upon this floor could not be had, and to this day, as I have stated, there has never been more than the slightest reference to its merits made in this House. It is for that reason that I am very hopeful that such attention may be attracted to the merits of the measure as to at least call for its free and open discussion.

In order to conform to the chronological order of events as they have to do with the history of this measure, I have thus far only quoted from the letters of Secretary of State Hay and Secretary of State Root, but I am pleased, in support of my contention that this bill ought to pass, to be able now to quote from a very recent letter from our distinguished Secretary of State, William J. Bryan, who, on the 15th instant, wrote to Representative EDWARD W. POU, chairman of the Committee on Claims, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington.

Hon. EDWARD W. POU,
Chairman Committee on Claims,
House of Representatives.

SIR: At the request of Miss Ellen M. Stone, the American missionary who was abducted by Turkish brigands in 1901, the department desires to call attention to the message of President Roosevelt to the Congress March 26, 1908, transmitting the letter of Secretary Root on the subject of repayment by the Government to the contributors of the money raised to pay the ransom for the release of Miss Stone, amounting to \$66,000. It appears that the Department of State announced in 1901, while Miss Stone was in the hands of the brigands, that if the ransom were raised and paid by private persons every effort would be made to obtain reimbursement from the Government, which might be found impossible to hold any foreign government responsible, the department was willing to urge that Congress appropriate money to repay the contributors. Subsequent investigation appeared to show the irresponsibility of any foreign government, and therefore the department takes this occasion again to recommend that Congress make such appropriation.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

W. J. BRYAN.

To which Representative Pou sent the following letter under date of the 18th:

JULY 18, 1914.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Acknowledging receipt of yours of the 15th instant, I beg to say that S. 1864, for the relief of the contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund, is now before this committee for consideration.

Personally I have always favored the return of this money, and this committee made a favorable report on the bill for the refunding of this money during the Sixty-second Congress.

Faithfully, yours,

CHAIRMAN.

While perhaps the international questions involved have no pertinency at this time inasmuch as the State Department has for satisfactory reasons seen proper to no further press these claims, yet there is to my mind an undoubted obligation on the part of Congress after these long years to do not the generous but the just thing to those who, upon the suggestion of the State Department—not to put it any stronger—came forward to release a subject of this country from the Turkish outlaws. And the fact that several other foreign nations within a few years, both before and after Miss Stone's capture, demanded and received satisfaction from the Turkish Government for similar outrages to their own subjects, does not excuse this Government from reimbursing its own citizens for the contributions which brought about Miss Stone's release, resulting undoubtedly in the saving of no little embarrassment in our international relations with Turkey.

Miss Stone had been for many years doing a noble work as a missionary in Turkey. It was in the famous capital of that Empire that, more than 40 years before her unfortunate experiences there, a noble educational institution had been founded by an American interested in a similar work. Indeed, what higher praise can be bestowed upon the work of our foreign missions in any land than the founding of such an institution as Robert College, the outgrowth of the early mission work in a country whose needs so strongly appealed to its founders. Of that institution the late W. T. Stead, mourned among the lost of the *Titanic* disaster, wrote more than a dozen years ago as follows:

That American college is to-day the chief hope of the future of the millions who inhabit the Sultan's dominions. They have 200 students in the college to-day, but they have trained and sent out into the world thousands of bright, brainy young fellows who have carried the leaven of the American town meeting into all Provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

But it is not alone in Turkey that the splendid work of these noble men and women has borne such fruit; for may we not in all truth point to the great governmental reforms that, at the end of more than 50 years of mission work in China, have awakened the people of that mighty country to the civilizing influences of the popular republican form of government.

To those who may fear that the enactment of this measure into a law may establish a harmful precedent for the future I wish to say that I have no fear of such result. It is, in fact, the only case to my mind upon which Congress has been called to act involving such conditions. But is it not true that during almost every term of Congress we have legislated not only to pay for outrages committed by our own outlaws upon foreign subjects, but we have likewise demanded and received reparation for similar outrages committed upon our own citizens in other lands? There would seem to me to be certainly no difference in principle from Congress paying to reimburse its own citizens when our Government has failed to secure payment from the offending nation than to make payment, as has been our practice in many instances, to foreign Governments because of the outrages committed by our own citizens. If, again, it is claimed that the payment of this money would in any way benefit Miss Stone, the one who of all others is most interested to see justice done, let me say, for the information of this House, that she has assured me that not a single dollar of such reimbursement would go to her. Above all, the one who has spent so many of her best years in this noble missionary work must feel that the honor of our Nation is involved, and to my mind she is entirely right in that view of the matter.

USE OF REVENUE CUTTERS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Mr. GOOD rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] asks unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I made some remarks in criticism of the action of the Secretary of the Treasury, because of the unlawful use of revenue cutters. Those remarks were spoken on the floor of the House. On the 18th there was printed in the *RECORD* a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, criticizing me for words spoken on the floor of the House. From that criticism I read the following:

Please allow me to thank you for having so effectively replied to the statements of Mr. Good, which I can ascribe only to utter ignorance on his part of the law and the long-standing custom of the department, or to wanton misrepresentation.

Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday the Secretary of the Treasury, William G. McAdoo, caused to be published in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* a letter addressed to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] in which he attempts to justify his unauthorized and unlawful use of revenue cutters.

It was not necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to remind Congress or any of its Members of the great benefits derived from the Revenue-Cutter Service. Congress has long recognized the great importance of this service and has annually appropriated all that has been estimated as necessary for its continuance. Nor was it necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to point out that it is no violation of law for him to go aboard a revenue cutter for the purpose of familiarizing himself with his duties.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. To make the point that the gentleman is not speaking to a question of personal privilege but instead is scolding the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair thinks that the phrase in there, "wanton misrepresentation," constitutes a question of personal privilege. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is a sort of delicate circumlocutionary way of calling a man a liar. [Laughter and applause.] The Chair as long as he is in this chair is not going to permit outsiders to infringe upon the privileges of any Member of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury is the head of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and it is his duty to become familiar with the needs and details of that service. Such a use of the revenue cutters by the Secretary of the Treasury should receive our warm commendation. It was no such use of revenue cutters that I complained of. It was the unauthorized and unlawful private use of which I then complained and which I now condemn.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to analyze this very remarkable letter of Secretary McAdoo's, for when it is squared with the facts it shows not only a violation of the law by the Secretary of the Treasury, but it shows a willful violation of the act of June 7, 1894, which provides that "hereafter revenue cutters shall be used exclusively for public service and in no way for private purposes."

In his letter Secretary McAdoo states:

Mr. Good says: "It is a notorious fact that every Friday or thereabouts at this time of the year the revenue-cutter *Frederic* leaves Boston, comes to Washington, and is loaded down with Democratic officials, and they are taken for a cruise down the Potomac at Government expense." This statement is utterly without foundation.

I confess to two inaccuracies in my statement. I was misinformed as to the name of the revenue cutter which I then had in mind, and inadvertently gave the starting point at Boston instead of Baltimore, but these were immaterial parts of the statement which the Secretary of the Treasury says "is utterly without foundation."

The facts are that the revenue cutter *Apache* during this entire summer has been leaving Baltimore on Friday, reaching Washington Saturday morning, and leaving Washington Saturday afternoon loaded with Democratic officeholders and politicians, selected by the Secretary of the Treasury and his assistants for a cruise down the Potomac. The *Apache* returns to Washington Monday morning, discharges her precious cargo, and leaves for Baltimore, where she arrives on Tuesday. The Secretary in his letter justifies this practice in the following language:

In all such instances officers of the Government have been permitted to use the revenue cutters only when it did not interfere with the proper cruising arrangements of the vessels.

Here we are told by Secretary McAdoo that officers of the Government are permitted to use revenue cutters for private purposes the law to the contrary notwithstanding, "when it did not interfere with the proper cruising arrangements of the vessels." With the power of making all "cruising arrangements of the vessels" in Secretary McAdoo and his assistants, when, pray, will the desire of William G. McAdoo for an ocean voyage in a revenue cutter at Government expense be prevented because of "cruising arrangements of the vessels" made by Secretary McAdoo? Such an interpretation renders this provision of the law not only nugatory but it is silly. The trouble with the Secretary's explanation is that it explains nothing. In the first place, the law absolutely prohibits such junkets in revenue cutters. "Cruising orders" have nothing to do with the observance and enforcement of this law. They should be given with respect to the law and not in defiance of the law. In the second place, "cruising orders" for the revenue cutter *Apache* were given by Secretary McAdoo or his assistants. She was scheduled for these unlawful summer junkets down the

Potomac by the Secretary of the Treasury. By a study of her schedule you will observe that she is able to perform practically no other service, for she leaves Baltimore on Fridays and returns the following Tuesdays, leaving only Wednesdays and Thursdays to take on supplies for the next junket and to perform the public business.

I am told that because of this unlawful use of the *Apache* the members of the crew have had no gun practice all summer. They have been overworked in carrying out the orders of Secretary McAduo for these unlawful junkets, and they have a right to be dissatisfied.

It is important to know that Government business requiring a revenue cutter to take the friends of the administration for a cruise down the Potomac is on the wane. At any rate, for the first time in months she failed to make her regular trip last Saturday. [Applause on Republican side.] Why should she fail to make her regular trip on the first Saturday following the disclosure on the floor of the House of this unlawful use of revenue cutters? What is the matter of the "proper cruising arrangements of the vessels"?

Mr. MADDEN. Maybe her boilers were leaking.

Mr. GOOD. Strange, indeed, that this important public business down the Potomac should be so suddenly completed, and the use of revenue cutters in these waters so ruthlessly terminated right in the face of the approaching dog days.

The Secretary further states that:

On the occasion to which Mr. Good refers, namely, July 5, 1914, I did arrive at Mattapoisett, Mass., on the revenue cutter *Onondaga*. The *Onondaga* was under cruising orders, and I accompanied her on that cruise. Every item of expense occasioned by my presence and that of my wife was paid by me.

Mr. MADDEN. And for the coal and the oil?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Having previously stated in his letter that his presence on revenue cutters was in performance of his official duties, he would have Congress and the country believe that he was on the *Onondaga* because his official duties called him there. Now, what are the facts? Secretary and Mrs. McAduo have their summer home at Mattapoisett, Mass., which can be reached from Washington by water. They were here and desired to go to their summer home. An ocean trip on a steam yacht unquestionably looked inviting. By a rather strange coincidence, just as the Secretary and Mrs. McAduo were ready to start for Mattapoisett, the revenue cutter *Onondaga*, pursuant to "cruising orders," was also ready to leave Washington for Mattapoisett, a village of 1,200 on the Massachusetts coast. Of course the *Onondaga* was on Government business. But the Secretary's statement that he paid for his meals on the trip causes a little confusion. If Secretary McAduo was on official business, as claimed, why should he have been compelled to pay for his meals? If he was called from Washington on official business why should not the Government pay for his meals? On the contrary, he was using that revenue cutter as a private yacht for private purposes. This being true, he should at least have paid all of the expenses of the voyage. He should have paid not only the trifling expense of his meals, but should have paid all the heavy expenses which were paid by the Government. The fact that he paid for his meals is in itself an acknowledgment that he was not on the *Onondaga* on official business and that he knew he was violating the law. Why, you ask, should the Government at large expense send this vessel on this long voyage for private purposes in violation of the law for the convenience and comfort of the Secretary of the Treasury? There is one reason why this was done and only one. Secretary McAduo wanted to go, he wanted to take an ocean voyage at Government expense. He had charge of "the proper cruising arrangements of the vessels." He was willing to violate the law and so he violated it.

Mr. Speaker, the unlawful uses of revenue cutters by Secretary McAduo justifies a more severe condemnation of his acts than I have attempted to make. The example set by this official only prompts minor officials of the Government to violate the law. This is illustrated by the clipping which I have here from the Times-Dispatch, of Richmond, Va., under date of June 6, 1914, which contains a description of a pleasure trip given by Norman R. Hamilton, at Norfolk, Va., from which I quote:

At Newport News the party was met by Mr. Norman R. Hamilton, collector at Norfolk. Later they were the guests of Mr. Hamilton aboard one of the vessels of the customhouse fleet, and after being shown the interesting points on Hampton Roads were carried to Norfolk.

This morning I received a letter from Massachusetts, and I quote the following:

Why kick on Secretary McAduo alone? There are others, perhaps. "Everybody is doing it."

[Laughter.]

This is an example of real Democratic economy. These "cruising arrangements" at this season of the year are apparently very popular with at least a great part of this Democratic administration. These voyages in luxurious steam yachts at Government expense have not been denounced by a single Democrat connected with the administration.

Mr. MADDEN. It saves the man using them from going to the expense of purchasing a private yacht.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman from Illinois has no right to take possession of the floor and interject remarks without the permission of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut is entirely correct. [Laughter and applause.] It is a bad habit that Members drift into.

Mr. GOOD. Hence I am led to inquire whether the unlawful and private use of these yachts are intended as a performance of that platform pledge of the Democratic Party wherein it declares:

We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of July 21, 1914.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing an editorial on the same subject from the New York Times. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, bearing on this same subject is an editorial in the New York Times of July 21—

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Can the gentleman under the guise of personal privilege and under the ruling of the Chair in regard to "wanton misrepresentation" proceed to read the opinion of all the newspapers in the country or any newspaper on the question of Mr. McAduo's conduct?

The SPEAKER. The situation is this: The gentleman has a perfect right to read that editorial if he wants to do so under the guise of personal privilege. Of course, the Speaker would not permit an abusive or improper editorial to be read at all; but the gentleman, as long as he keeps within the limits of decent discussion, has a right to read any extract from anything he pleases up until his hour runs out.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Then, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Would the gentleman have a right before arguing or speaking or reading any article—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order the gentleman can not interrupt the gentleman from Iowa by a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. That is correct, too.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Well, I make the point of order that the editorial the gentleman proposes to read is not germane to the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not tell until he hears it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the editorial referred to is as follows:

[Editorial from the New York Times, July 21, 1914.]

THE RESEARCHES OF M'ADOO.

Secretary McAduo's defense against the charge of Congressman Good that he has been "joy riding" in revenue cutters is well enough so far as it confines itself to the argument that he has been doing what all his predecessors have done and that he has paid his expenses. But he ceases to be impressive when he undertakes to give the impression that he has been cruising around with his wife in the discharge of his official duties. And he becomes positively humorous when he says:

"On two occasions within the last 17 months when I have been on board revenue cutters rescues were made at sea, and I secured knowledge which I have applied with great advantage to the administration."

[Laughter.]

It is a new idea that the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury require him to go out cruising in Government boats to study the processes by which rescues are made. It conjures up a picture of a dignified statesman industriously making notes as a drowning man is hauled aboard from a sinking boat—

[Laughter.]

And jotting down such memoranda as "Man hauled aboard by rope. Query. Would not stepladder be better? Length of time occupied in climbing side, 50 seconds. Consult efficiency engineer to see if time can not be reduced in future."

Or perhaps Mr. McAdoo means us to understand that he is studying the art of rescue under the impression that his official position calls upon him to perform such duties himself, and he wants to be prepared. If so, he is setting an alarming precedent for his successors. No elderly and sedentary gentleman will wish to become Secretary of the Treasury if he is liable, in the midst of the preparation of a currency bill, to be interrupted with a call to put on his oilskins and slide down the side to man a rescue boat.

Mr. Speaker, some little criticism was made of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] because he rushed to the defense the other day of the Secretary of the Treasury. Everybody here and elsewhere knows that there is no more efficient legislator on either side of this House than the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Few men have acquired the knowledge of appropriations and the expenses of running this Government that has been acquired by the gentleman from New York, but I am a little afraid that he set a precedent the other day that will disturb him when it comes to making appropriations for this Revenue-Cutter Service. It is perfectly natural, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New York should defend the Secretary of the Treasury. The gentleman from New York and Secretary McAdoo come from the same State—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that he is not pursuing his personal-privilege question when he is talking about the gentleman from New York even if he is talking in a complimentary way. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am about through talking in a complimentary way, and I think I will be able to get back to the point. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly natural that the gentleman should rush to his defense. They both come from New York. Thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars of patronage is at stake in the State of New York, and it is—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to continue his complimentary remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman could pronounce an eulogy upon the gentleman from New York at the proper time, but the gentleman from New York is not mixed up with this question of personal privilege.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I do not want to be. But if the gentleman thinks it helps his case to abuse me, I am so accustomed to it that it will not do any harm.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was complimenting you.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It did not sound like it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] be permitted to continue the line of talk in which he has been indulging. Is there objection?

Mr. BOOHER and Mr. DONOVAN objected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] finished with his remarks?

Mr. GOOD. I yield the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] frequently rises in his place and says, "I object, Mr. Speaker," or "Point of order, Mr. Speaker." He never addresses the Chair in accordance with the rules, but the Speaker uniformly sustains him. I call the Speaker's attention to Rule XIV, paragraph 1, where it says:

When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker."

The SPEAKER. That is true; but if the Speaker ruled rigidly in favor of every technicality we would not adjourn until noon on the 4th of March next. Anybody presiding has to inject into these rules the elements of common sense in order to expedite business. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is whether it is not proper, under the rule to which I have referred, to address "Mr. Speaker" before saying "I object"?

The SPEAKER. That is undoubtedly correct. That is the formula.

Mr. MOORE. Then the gentleman from Connecticut is uniformly out of order in addressing the Chair?

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair sustains the gentleman from Connecticut half of the time and overrules him half of the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the Speaker remarked that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] was speaking in complimentary terms of myself. As a former dis-

tinguished college professor and president, the Speaker is familiar with that figure of rhetoric known as antithesis. The fact is the gentleman was attempting to build up a straw man by some complimentary remarks in order to lead up to the latter part of his remarks, which, before interrupted, seemed to assume that what I had said on a former occasion in reference to this matter was due to the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury had a very large amount of patronage at his command, and, as I came from the same State, my action had been thereby influenced. First, let me say, Mr. Speaker, for the Secretary of the Treasury, that his statement about the payment of his expenses while on these cutters is easily understood. The Government does not supply rations to the officers of the revenue cutters. Anyone who boards those vessels for any purpose and partakes of food must either partake of the rations furnished by the Government to the crews of the vessels or, unless he pays or reimburses the mess of the officers for what he consumes, must encroach upon the hospitality of the officers and consume that for which they pay themselves.

I think the statement that a revenue cutter leaves this town every Saturday loaded down with Democratic officeholders and politicians is purely Pickwickian. There is not a boatload of Democratic officeholders in Washington. [Laughter.] The Democratic politicians have been as scarce here as huckleberries in winter. The statements made a week or so ago about the Secretary of the Treasury were made without any advance knowledge on this side. Without having time to investigate, I called attention to what I thought was their preposterous character. My action and my statement were not actuated by any favors I have received from the Secretary of the Treasury, nor by the hope of any favors to be received from him in the future. It may clarify the situation for me to state that while we are of the same party and are cooperating in one administration to carry out the promises of our party as enunciated in its national platform, that I have very little sympathy with the Secretary's views and the Secretary apparently has very little sympathy with my views as to what is desirable to be done in matters of appointments affecting the people I represent or for those in adjoining districts in Congress. It makes no difference to me what the Secretary of the Treasury does with his patronage. So far as the discharge of my official duties are concerned, my actions will not be affected. I have not been the beneficiary of his gratitude or of his favor, and I have no expectation that I will be. But when an official of the Government—Democrat, Republican, or nondescript—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. When I finish this statement—has statements made about him on the floor which reflect upon him in any way, and I believe I can contribute to the general enlightenment of the House, I shall not be deterred from attempting to furnish the information or induced to furnish it because of favor received or denied or hope of future benefit.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman make that statement in view of the publication in the Post this morning, that all the New York Federal patronage has been turned over to and put in charge of Secretary McAdoo?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. It is unfortunate for me, I guess; but I make it just the same.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has intimated again that my conduct has been actuated by that fact. That is a somewhat serious charge; first, because some people will misunderstand the motive actuating me in the discharge of my public duties; and, second, a large number of hopeful persons will misunderstand my ability to aid them in the ambitions they entertain.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a moment. I wish to state once and for all, so far as I am concerned, that with the exception of a \$1200 position in an exempt class and a temporary position for six weeks, which I turned over to one of my colleagues, I have received no patronage from the Treasury Department, and I do not expect to receive any. So that, so far as either obtaining help to assist me politically in the past or hoping to obtain it in the future from the Treasury Department, it has not had the slightest influence in determining me to make the statement that I have made. In view of what I believed—and I do not intend to be offensive—to be unfounded, preposterous, and ridiculous statements of the use of the revenue cutters and which because of familiarity with the service, and my knowledge of the conditions, my confidence in the integrity and high purpose of the Secretary of the Treasury, regardless of any differences of opinion I might have with him politically, I was convinced could not be accurate. I did not hesitate to state my belief. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not know who furnishes the information about these matters. It was inti-

mated the other day that the Secretary of the Treasury had turned a revenue cutter over to his son, so that he might use it for his honeymoon.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. As a matter of fact, Mr. McAdoo's son went on his honeymoon on the yacht *Marguerite*, the property of the father of the young lady whom he married. These little intimations and suggestions are likely to be criticized by people who think that the mere suggestion of a fact is a fact in itself, and it results in gross injustice to men in public life.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman does not mean to say that I intimated that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. I do not mean to say that the suggestion was made by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. Does not the gentleman think now, since he has mentioned that fact, that he ought to state what is reported as having taken place when young Mr. McAdoo and his bride were on that cruise, so far as his father used a revenue cutter to intercept them, and in the early hours of the morning caused a gun, or it may have been 5 guns, or 16 guns, or perhaps 21 guns, to be fired across the bow of the yacht in which young Mr. McAdoo was cruising?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, such was the character of all these statements. The other day I happened to visit the office of the Secretary of the Treasury on a matter of public business affecting my work in the House when he referred to this statement and stated what the facts were—that his son and his wife had made a trip on the yacht *Marguerite*, the property of a gentleman in Baltimore, the father-in-law of his son. The only possible connection there could be between the suggestion as to the use of the revenue cutter and the fact was that as the Secretary had attended the wedding in Baltimore that day and the revenue cutter *Apache* was leaving Baltimore on a regularly scheduled trip that night to Washington he had returned to Washington on the revenue cutter.

This new suggestion that the revenue cutter fired guns across the bow of a private yacht, except in the performance of official duty, seems to intimate charges—although there are no charges—that the Secretary of the Treasury could be guilty of descending to such common horseplay that I am unable to believe that a man of his characteristics and culture and attainments could possibly be guilty of. [Applause.] Such statements are unfortunate. If the law is violated at any time, I am perfectly free in my criticism of those who violate it. But I remember that when I was in the minority all the disgruntled soreheads and discontented persons in every branch of the public service were continually furnishing me with what was supposed to be information of grave dereliction of duty on the part of high officials in the Republican administration. I consigned 99.99 per cent of them to the wastebasket. Upon investigation I found out that an infinitesimal fraction of the other one one-hundredth per cent of them had very little foundation. I have not the slightest doubt that this same group of marplots, soreheads, disgruntled, discontented, no-account, don't-want-to-work employees in the Government have now turned their attention to gentlemen on the other side. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman from New York trying to convince his constituents that he has no influence with the administration, or is he afraid that his constituents will think he has some influence with the administration? [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. The question of whether or not I have any influence with the administration is absolutely of no importance. If I can not be elected to Congress, if I can not stay in Congress because of what I do in the performance of my official duty, I do not want to be here because of the influence of an administration. [Applause.] No administration, no man, nor any person ever controlled or ever will control my acts as an official and as a Member of this body. If I can not remain in public life to represent what I honestly and intelligently believe to be the things that my constituents want, and which I honestly believe should be advocated and done, I am ready to go out. I have a great deal of respect for myself, although a great many others do not always seem to have much. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he agrees with the Secretary of the Treasury that it is no abuse or violation of the law to use revenue cutters for private purposes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not say that. The Secretary made no such statement. If I were the Secretary of the Treasury and had the Revenue-Cutter Service in my jurisdiction, which under a previous administration had been criticized and recommended for abolishment, to have its boats scattered among a number of different departments and its functions absorbed by half a dozen, with all the high-brow efficiency experts and reformers and adjusters of governmental affairs insisting that it should be abolished, I should have been sufficiently interested to know something about the personnel and the boats and the manner in which the officers and men performed the functions of the Revenue-Cutter Service to go aboard one occasionally myself and risk the charge that in doing so I was using the cutter for private purposes. [Applause.] Any man who is afraid to do the things that he believes are essential for the proper discharge of his official duties because of the fear that some one may criticize him or charge him with having done an unauthorized act or a wrong act is not fit to hold the office, and he ought to get out. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. I would like to have an answer to the question.

Mr. DONOVAN. This is a proposition for unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You can not take the gentleman off the floor in that way.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, just a suggestion. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] got unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Just how long ago that was I do not know, but it seems much longer ago than—

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman from New York got unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. GARNER. I have no desire to take the gentleman off the floor; but this is Calendar Wednesday, and there are important matters on the calendar affecting Texas and other States, and—

The SPEAKER. It seems that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asked for three minutes, and in that case the gentleman's time expired long ago.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did the Speaker say my time was up?

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for one minute to answer a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] be extended to answer a question. Is there objection?

Mr. BOOHER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Connecticut rise?

Mr. DONOVAN. To make a proposition for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit it.

Mr. DONOVAN. To address the House for 10 minutes on the subject that people who live in glass houses, and mighty thin glass at that, had better be conspicuous by keeping quiet—

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. DONOVAN. I have not stated the proposition yet.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objected as soon as he heard what it was.

Mr. DONOVAN. I think there are ways of objecting.

FRANCES OWEN LURTON.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To submit a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is a Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) on the Speaker's table. If it is not considered to-day, it can not be considered at all. It will only take a minute or two if the House will agree to consider it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be taken from the Speaker's table and considered at this time.

Mr. SHERLEY. What is it about?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask that it be read for information.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read it for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17824) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1914, and for prior years, and for other purposes, be, and the same is hereby authorized to insert under the head "Department of Justice, miscellaneous objects," the following item: "To pay to Frances Owen Lurton, widow of Horace Harmon Lurton, late a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, \$14,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, has the conference report on the general deficiency bill been submitted this morning?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The conference report was submitted this morning.

Mr. MANN. Is it a complete report?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; it is not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is one item in disagreement.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is a disagreement on one item.

I will state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and to the House that I am informed that this same sort of procedure was followed in the case of the widow of Mr. Justice Harlan, and also, if I mistake not, in the case of Mr. Justice Brewer. Mr. Justice Lurton was not a wealthy man, and if this sum is to be paid, it seems to me it would be a very proper mark of respect to his memory to let it go through now, as the Senate unanimously decided ought to be done.

Mr. MANN. I take it, if this resolution goes through now, it will have become the established practice of the Government to appropriate one year's salary to the widow of a deceased Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not know how soon that would extend to the widows of deceased circuit judges, but I think it ought to be—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will pardon me, I just stated that the same practice was followed in the two cases I have cited.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember in reference to the Brewer case, but I remember in reference to the Harlan case, where there were claimed to be very exceptional circumstances. I do not know what the facts in this case may be. It comes in now purely as a matter of precedent, on the theory that it is following an established custom. I am not willing to do that without having it brought before the House in such a way that it can be considered and voted upon. I do not think we ought to take to-day on this proposition, and if it is opened to discussion it will take the whole day. Therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House requests for leave of absence, which the Clerk read, as follows:

Mr. SHERWOOD requests leave of absence, indefinitely, to repair vital energies.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois requests leave of absence, for five days, on account of illness.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear those requests. Reserving the right to object, will the Clerk please read them over again?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the requests again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHERWOOD requests leave of absence, indefinitely, to repair vital energies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I shall not object to that request from Gen. SHERWOOD, but any similar request from anybody else in the House will be objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois requests leave of absence for five days on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1914.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MR. SPEAKER: I have this day tendered to the governor of Ohio my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the fourteenth congressional district of Ohio, to take effect on Thursday, July 23, 1914.

Respectfully,

WM. G. SHARP.

EXTENSION OF PAYMENT UNDER RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the unfinished business is the irrigation bill. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 4628) extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes, with Mr. Flood of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COX. Is the bill open now for amendment?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that the bill is open for amendment. We have read the first section.

Mr. COX. The first section has been read?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; and I presume it is in order to have the committee amendments to that section read first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there are four committee amendments pending.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I ask that the committee amendments be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, after the word "fund," strike out the word "two" and insert the word "five."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "shall," insert the word "each."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. If that amendment is agreed to to perfect the text, will it still be in order to move to strike out the perfected text and insert an amendment in lieu thereof? I take it that is the parliamentary situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite understand the intent of the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois. Of course the Chair understands that it is a well-established rule that the House having passed on a matter, an amendment proposing a change can not thereafter be offered. I think that rule has been too strictly enforced, for it has been very strictly enforced.

The CHAIRMAN. The inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois was, if after the text had been perfected an amendment could be offered striking out a portion of the paragraph containing the perfected text.

Mr. MANN. Yes; I take it that if this amendment is agreed to it will be in order to strike out that language, including the perfected amendment, and insert other matter.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the ruling of the Chair. If this amendment is adopted to perfect the text, then an amendment will be in order striking out the language, including the perfected text.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in order that this matter may be understood, the House might adopt all the committee amendments, and under the ruling of the Chair just made the gentleman from Illinois might then propose a new section in lieu of this section, restoring the old section as it was in the bill originally. Manifestly, that could not be done under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that if an amendment is offered to perfect a section, that afterwards an amendment striking out the language, including the perfected portion, is in order.

Mr. MONDELL. The Chair does not hold that after amending the section a motion could be made that would undo all that had been done by the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that if the amendments were for the purpose of perfecting the section, that after the section was perfected an amendment would be in order striking the section out.

Mr. MONDELL. I realize that the Chair can not rule intelligently until we have a concrete case before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment which has been reported by the Clerk.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "remainder," insert the words "shall each be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "available," insert the words "as announced by the Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for 30 minutes. I will state that there was an understanding the other day, just before general debate was finished, between the chairman of the committee and the ranking member on this side that they would ask that I should be allowed 30 minutes to discuss the bill generally early in the consideration of the bill to-day. That was done near the close of general debate.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in support of the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that on last Thursday, when the general debate was closed, we did promise that early in the debate to-day we would do our utmost to secure for the gentleman from Oklahoma 30 minutes' time. It was not stipulated whether he should take it all at one time or along during the debate. I tried to persuade the gentleman to take it at different times along through the debate, but nevertheless I want to keep faith with him. He did agree to withdraw objection at that time to closing general debate with the understanding that he should have an opportunity to address the House for 30 minutes, and I hope there will be no objection to his proceeding.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding also that the gentleman should have 30 minutes.

Mr. GARNER. Let us have the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object for a moment, I call the attention of the gentleman from Colorado to the fact that I spoke to him about having some time, and he indicated to me that personally, as far as he was concerned, I might have it. I should not want more than 10 minutes, and might not use that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I intend to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania shall have some time, but I hope the gentleman will wait until later in the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am a western man; I live in a Western State; I represent a western district. My sympathies are with the West, and it is with a great deal of reluctance on my part that I rise to criticize some of the features of this bill, and unless the bill shall be amended I will be constrained to vote against it. My objections to this bill arise mainly on account of the manner in which the reclamation fund has been distributed, on account of the way the law has been administered.

In other words, Oklahoma has been discriminated against. The State has not received any benefit under the law, though we have contributed nearly \$6,000,000 to the fund.

But some of my objections to the bill are not based upon considerations for my own State or for my own people, but are based upon the highest national interests. There may be some here who are not entirely familiar with the provisions of the original reclamation act, and I want to read section 9 of the original act. It is as follows:

SEC. 9. That it is hereby declared to be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of this act, so far as the same may be practicable and subject to the existence of feasible irrigation projects, to expend the major portion of the funds arising from the sale of public lands within each State and Territory hereinbefore named for the benefit of arid and semiarid lands within the limits of such State or Territory: *Provided*, That the Secretary may temporarily use such portion of said funds for the benefit of arid or semiarid lands in any particular State or Territory hereinbefore named as he may deem advisable, but when so used the excess shall be restored to the fund as soon as practicable, to the end that ultimately, and in any event within each 10-year period after the passage of this act, the expenditures for the benefit of the said States and Territories shall be equalized according to the proportions and subject to the conditions as to practicability and feasibility aforesaid.

Mr. Chairman, there are three propositions involved in this section. First, this section makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to use the major portion of the fund derived from any State from the sale of public lands for the benefit of the land within that State; second, the Secretary is authorized temporarily, and only temporarily, to use funds that come from one State to construct a project in another State; third, the

object and purpose of all this is declared to be that at the end of every 10-year period the funds derived from all the States shall be equalized among the States, so that each State may receive at least a major part of the funds it has contributed.

How has that been carried out? I have a table here which shows the amount which each State has contributed and the amount that has been expended in each State. The table is as follows:

Receipts to the reclamation fund from sale of public lands in each State and the amount expended on irrigation projects in each State to Apr. 30, 1914, including bond fund.

States.	Receipts from sale of public lands.	Expenditures on irrigation projects.
Arizona.....	\$1,455,000.00	\$17,049,211.31
Idaho.....	5,039,708.90	16,181,170.51
Washington.....	6,433,290.73	9,475,583.36
Colorado.....	6,680,991.93	8,837,577.55
Montana.....	8,588,290.73	8,334,430.39
Nevada.....	541,596.96	6,781,272.03
Wyoming.....	4,320,900.46	6,614,027.90
New Mexico.....	3,939,790.95	6,531,423.80
Nebraska.....	1,664,013.83	5,797,553.83
Utah.....	1,890,473.34	4,652,949.61
Oregon.....	10,413,928.22	4,371,791.08
South Dakota.....	6,823,778.66	3,219,097.83
California.....	5,358,943.03	3,073,542.59
Texas.....		2,817,928.90
North Dakota.....	11,921,898.43	1,947,467.20
Kansas.....	963,080.07	376,471.29
Oklahoma.....	5,783,557.84	72,512.10
Preliminary investigations.....		80,488.73
General accounts.....		259,855.99
Total.....	\$1,504,919.82	106,374,053.01

This table shows that Arizona has contributed \$1,455,000 to the fund, but there has been expended in the State \$17,049,000. Idaho has furnished \$5,000,000, and has received \$16,181,000. Arizona and Idaho together have furnished to the fund \$6,500,000, and have received \$33,000,000. These two States have received over two-fifths of the entire amount received from the sale of public lands. Washington has contributed \$6,500,000 to the fund, and there has been expended in this State \$9,500,000. Colorado has contributed \$6,558,000 and received \$8,837,000. Nevada has contributed only \$541,596, but there has been expended in Nevada \$6,781,272. Wyoming has contributed \$4,320,000, and there has been expended in Wyoming \$6,614,000. Oregon has contributed \$10,413,000, and there has been expended in Oregon \$4,371,000. North Dakota has contributed to the fund \$11,921,000, and there has been expended in the State \$1,947,000. Oklahoma has contributed \$5,783,000 to the reclamation fund, and there has been expended in the State \$72,588.99. The amount expended in Oklahoma was spent in surveys and in some experimental work on the North Fork of Red River.

Mr. Chairman, this table shows conclusively that the original law has not been carried out. What was the nature of that law? It should have been regarded in the character of a compact, an agreement, an understanding, a pledge between these 16 States that this fund should be distributed among the States strictly according to the compact between the States as expressed in the original act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman is aware, no doubt, that section 9 of the original act from which he read a few moments ago was repealed by the reclamation bonding act of 1910, and that it is not now a part of the law.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am aware of this fact. But in my opinion its repeal is no credit to the Representatives from those States which have secured the larger part of the reclamation fund. When the provision to repeal section 9 was before the House, I offered an amendment to strike that provision out. I appealed to the House not to repeal that section. But my efforts were unsuccessful. To my surprise the gentlemen representing the great Northwestern and Southwestern States, the States where the reclamation fund has been largely expended, did not come to my relief. Certainly the gentleman whose State has received more than its share of this fund will not claim that it is any credit to his people that the original compact for the use and distribution of this fund has been violated.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman think that the Federal Government ought to construct reclamation projects whether conditions exist which make them feasible or not, but simply for

the purpose of expending some money in some one's district or State?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I do not.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that the provision to which he refers—of equalization—contained another provision under which no project could be undertaken unless a project was determined to be a feasible one. He knows that, does he not?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I understand that very well.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not the trouble with the gentleman's State that it has not advanced or brought forward or shown and in fact has no feasible irrigation project?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I knew that proposition would come up. The gentlemen representing the other States must have some excuse for preventing Oklahoma from having its share of this fund, and that is one of the excuses they now make, that Oklahoma has no practicable or feasible project; but I ask the gentleman—and the gentleman remembers my effort to prevent the repeal of section 9—if there were no feasible project in Oklahoma, then no money could be spent there; and then what could have been the harm in allowing section 9 to remain in that bill?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me to answer that?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Briefly.

Mr. MONDELL. I was not one of those who favored or was anxious to have that modification made. That was insisted upon in order that we might secure the advance of \$20,000,000 from the Treasury. But the gentleman from Oklahoma knows, I think he should know, that had the law remained exactly as it was, had there been no change, Oklahoma would not have secured any project, because she has no feasible location for a project, and the modification of the statute could not change the situation so far as Oklahoma was concerned.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. The gentleman is greatly mistaken when he states that there are no feasible irrigation projects in Oklahoma. The reports of the Reclamation Service show to the contrary. But the department has doubted the propriety of undertaking these projects up to the present time. But we have the feasible projects.

I will admit that up to the present time it has been immaterial as to the repeal of section 9. And why? Because prior to that time the fund had been appropriated and plans had been made to use all this fund in Wyoming, Montana, Washington, Idaho, and other States; and the repeal of section 9 does not prevent the construction of irrigation works in Oklahoma no more than it prevents the construction of irrigation works in any other State. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Washington as a Representative the one thing I wished most to accomplish was to secure for Oklahoma some part of that great reclamation fund, and I went to the department soon after I came here. I saw the Secretary of the Interior; I saw the Director of the Reclamation Service, and I made my appeal for something for Oklahoma; but while I was courteously treated, yet I was told that there were no funds; that the funds were needed to complete works which had been already begun. And then I was told it would be necessary to issue \$20,000,000 in bonds in order to increase this fund so we could partially complete projects already begun in the other States. And then came the bond proposition. I went before the Ways and Means Committee, that had jurisdiction of the bill to issue \$20,000,000 in irrigation bonds. The gentleman from Wyoming remembers. I opposed the repeal of section 9, and when the bill was brought in the House I opposed the repeal. The law should have been allowed to stand as originally enacted. Now, every act of Congress has its history. So has the reclamation act. I have read the proceedings of the Fifty-seventh Congress, which passed this bill. The gentleman from Wyoming was a Member of the House at that time; and no doubt for the good of his State, as well as for the good of the country at large, he has been returned to this House and is here to-day. In a speech made by Mr. MONDELL, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12, 1902, he said:

At the beginning of the present session of Congress the Representatives from the 16 States and Territories embraced within the arid and semiarid portion of our country, believing that the time was ripe to present to the Congress a comprehensive plan of national undertaking of irrigation enterprise, formed a committee of 17 members, composed of Representatives and Senators from the region referred to, and this committee set about the formulation of a measure for the consideration of Congress. Most careful consideration was given to every detail of the proposed legislation, and after much discussion the measure was formulated and introduced in either House. Criticisms and suggestions were made relative to it, and as to the effect or intent of certain of its provisions, and after further thought and discussion the measure was finally amended in a way satisfactory, it is believed, to all of those favorable to national irrigation legislation and presented for your consideration.

Now, in the report of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, also made by the gentleman from Wyoming, upon this bill it is stated:

Section 9 is intended to insure an uniform and harmonious development throughout the entire arid and semiarid region.

So that the object and purpose of section 9 was to secure, as the report says, written by the gentleman from Wyoming, "an uniform and harmonious development throughout the arid and semiarid region," and yet the fund has been so diverted that Oklahoma has been left entirely out in this "splendid, uniform, harmonious development" which the report describes. It may have been harmonious, but not uniform.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Just for a question.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows, notwithstanding the repeal of section 9, a project might at any time be undertaken in Oklahoma when funds are available, if a practical project can be found.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Well, I am aware of that. That is the one hope we have.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think the gentleman is fair to himself when he seems to convey the impression that he allowed Congress to shut that State out, because nothing of the kind was done.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I can not yield any further. It is true, under section 1, these funds are still to be used to irrigate lands in the States from which the funds came, so that the Secretary still has the power to use these funds in Oklahoma; and I still believe that somewhere along the line Oklahoma will get something out of this great fund. I shall not give up hope as long as I remain in this House that some time, somewhere, the gentlemen from Wyoming, Nebraska, and Washington, and those other great Western States will come to aid and assist me in securing justice for Oklahoma. I shall not cease while I shall remain a Member of this House to work for justice to my constituents and my State. We are entitled to our share of the benefits of this act. In time I have faith we will get our dues.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not mean by that that he desires us to aid him in securing money for a project that is not feasible—

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. No, sir.

Mr. MONDELL. And that could not be successfully carried out?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. No, sir; neither—

Mr. MONDELL. Whenever his State presents a feasible project—

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma (continuing). Neither myself nor a single homesteader in Oklahoma would divert a single penny of this sacred fund to be wasted upon an impracticable project. Now, gentlemen make a splendid appeal here in behalf of the homesteaders on reclamation projects, and that comes very near to my heart, because I represent homesteaders largely. I have been among homesteaders in the West for 29 years. I think I know as much about homesteaders and their wants and have as high appreciation of the services they have rendered to the Nation as any man on the floor of this House, and yet I must look first to the homesteaders of my own district and my own State. I must see that their interests are not put in jeopardy.

And think about it, will you? You may take four or five of the northwestern counties of the State of Oklahoma—Woodward, Harper, Beaver, Texas, and Cimarron—extending out and including what was formerly "No Man's Land," a strip 35 miles wide and 170 miles long, extending 50 miles out beyond the western line of the State of Kansas, and a large portion of these homesteaders who went there, did so believing that under this splendid reclamation fund which Congress had created by the act of June 17, 1902, those lands would be made more valuable and productive, by reason of great irrigation works in that section of the State. I say they have been struggling throughout the last 6, 8, 10, or 12 years contending against the difficulties and obstacles and enduring hardships, and it was these men who contributed this \$6,000,000, largely, to this fund. How did they get the \$6,000,000? The greater part of them mortgaged their lands to secure it, paying from 8 to 24 per cent interest. So this \$6,000,000 came through the hands of the homesteaders of Oklahoma. Their farms were mortgaged to contribute that amount to this fund, and yet you come here with a bill and ask me to vote to give your homesteaders 20 years' time, when by so doing you may still further defer the

time when an important irrigation work will be constructed in Oklahoma.

Now, what have we accomplished? Twelve years have passed since the reclamation act became a law. Have we succeeded? Have we accomplished what we expected to accomplish? Have we made no serious mistakes? I think no one will so assert. I find by reading the speeches and reports upon this bill that when it was first passed that it was predicted and estimated that under this fund, in the course of 30 or 40 years, we would reclaim perhaps from 20,000,000 to 60,000,000 acres of land; that upon these lands we would locate and provide homes for probably 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 people. That was the picture that was drawn. But what have we done in 10 or 12 years? We have expended \$106,000,000 and made homes for 11,000 homesteaders and occupants of land.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman wants to be entirely correct. We have expended only \$80,000,000, and we have made homes for approximately 60,000 people.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have the same tables that were furnished to the gentleman.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield a little further on that same proposition?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Not only have we made homes for those families that are on the reclamation projects, but for innumerable people that have come in, and who run stores and work in stores, and in little factories that supply lumber and supply material and other things in the communities that have been peopled by those who live on the reclamation projects.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. As I understand from the tables, \$31,000,000 has come from proceeds of the land. Twenty million dollars has come from the bond issue, and then about \$5,000,000 has come back from the payments that have been made on these lands, making about \$106,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. But only \$80,000,000 has been spent.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. It has not quite all been expended. This \$20,000,000 will go in a very few years. It has been appropriated and set apart for specific projects. And we have from this \$106,000,000, as I say, provided homes for 11,000 families, a population of 40,000 or 50,000 possibly. We have brought under irrigation only 1,250,000 acres of land. Texas County, Okla., which I represent, has 1,300,000 acres of land. Think about pouring into one county \$106,000,000!

Mr. Chairman, I doubt the propriety of extending the period for the payment of the cost of construction of irrigation works from 10 to 20 years. By so doing I think you will lessen the productive power of the reclamation fund, that it will reduce the ability of the fund to reclaim desert lands. The fact that owners of land must pay from \$40 to \$100 per acre to cover the cost of constructing the works makes it necessary to give the settlers and owners of the land reasonable time, and in view of the fact that the cost per acre has been much larger than was at first expected, gives a good ground for a reasonable extension, and to that I shall not object.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. McCoy having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 8660. An act to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act granting a franchise for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a street railway system in the district of South Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii," approved August 1, 1912.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1784) restoring to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for reservoir purposes at the headwaters of the Mississippi River and tributaries, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MYERS, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, and Mr. SMOOR as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 5957. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River in the States of Louisiana and Texas, about 2 miles west of Hunter, La.; and

S. 485. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

EXTENSION OF PAYMENT UNDER RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, if this bill is open for amendment I offer the following amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Have we adopted the committee amendments, all of them?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 16, by inserting after the word "established," the following: "In addition to the principal of the construction charge there shall be paid in each case annual interest upon the balance of the construction charge remaining unpaid at the rate of 3 per cent per annum."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything to what has been so ably stated by different gentlemen on this subject while the bill was under general debate. But it strikes me that to let these people have this tremendous amount of money without interest is absolutely indefensible. I am unable to conjure up in my mind any ground whatever that would justify this enormous appropriation year in and year out to the people engaged in farming on these reclamation projects without paying interest to the Government for the money put into them.

It has been demonstrated—at least to my mind conclusively—that the whole business is a failure, that it never has yielded back and never will, at least for a century to come, to the Government 100 cents on a dollar invested.

Now, to our friends on this side of the House I wish to say that we have inveighed year in and year out against special privilege. If this is not special-privilege legislation, I never saw it in my life. Ever since the year 1864, down to the year 1912—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-two gentlemen are present—not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Dooling	Kelster	Prouty
Alney	Dunn	Kennedy, Conn.	Rauch
Anthony	Eagan	Kless, Pa.	Rayburn
Aswell	Eagle	Kinkead, N. J.	Reilly, Conn.
Austin	Edmonds	Kitchin	Riordan
Avls	Edwards	Knowland, J. R.	Roberts, Mass.
Baker	Elder	Korby	Rucker
Barchfeld	Estopinal	Lafferty	Sabath
Bartholdt	Fairchild	Langham	Saunders
Bartlett	Farr	Lazaro	Scott
Beall, Tex.	Fields	L'Engle	Scully
Beil, Ga.	Frear	Leshner	Sharp
Borland	Gallagher	Lever	Sherwood
Bowdle	Gardner	Lewis, Pa.	Shreve
Broussard	George	Lindquist	Slyden
Brown, N. Y.	Gerry	Linthicum	Small
Browne, Wis.	Gill	Lloyd	Smith, J. M. C.
Buckner	Gillett	Lobeck	Smith, Md.
Burroughs	Gilmore	Loft	Smith, Tex.
Buchanan, Ill.	Glass	Logue	Stafford
Bulkley	Goldfogle	McClellan	Stanley
Burke, Pa.	Gorman	McGillcuddy	Stephens, Nebr.
Byrnes, S. C.	Goulden	McGuire, Okla.	Stringer
Calder	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin	Summers
Callaway	Griest	Mahan	Sutherland
Campbell	Griffin	Maher	Switzer
Candler, Miss.	Gudger	Manahan	Taylor, Ala.
Cantor	Guernsey	Martin	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantrill	Hamill	Merritt	Temple
Carew	Hamilton, Mich.	Metz	Ten Eyck
Carlin	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller	Thomas
Carr	Hammond	Morgan, La.	Thompson, Okla.
Cary	Hardwick	Morin	Vare
Chandler, N. Y.	Harris	Moss, W. Va.	Vaughan
Church	Hart	Mott	Vollmer
Clancy	Hayes	Murray, Mass.	Walker
Clark, Fla.	Henry	Murray, Okla.	Wallin
Coady	Hinds	Neeley, Kans.	Walsh
Connolly, Iowa	Hinebaugh	O'Brien	Walters
Cooper	Hobson	O'Leary	Weaver
Copley	Holland	O'Shaunessy	Whitacre
Covington	Houston	Padgett	White
Crisp	Howard	Palze, Mass.	Willis
Crosser	Hoxworth	Park	Wilson, N. Y.
Dale	Hughes, Ga.	Parker	Wingo
Davenport	Hughes, W. Va.	Patten, N. Y.	Winslow
Davis	Hulings	Patton, Pa.	Woods
Dickinson	Igoe	Peters, Me.	Young, Tex.
Dies	Jacoway	Peters, Mass.	
Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Porter	
	Jones	Powers	

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. COLLIER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Flood of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 4628) extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes, finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, whereupon

230 Members answered to their names, and he reported the names of the absentees to be entered upon the Journal.

Mr. MCCOY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a request for a correction of the Record.

Mr. MANN. That is not in order now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not in order now. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of Senate bill 4628.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FLOOD of Virginia in the chair.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be reported again, as several Members have come in who have not heard it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Cox:

Page 2, line 16, amend by inserting after the word "established" the following: "In addition to the principal of the construction charge there shall be paid in each case annual interest upon the balance of the construction charge remaining unpaid at the rate of 3 per cent per annum."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered is a very simple one, and needs no explanation from me. As an economic proposition, I believe it is clearly right. I can not see the wisdom, justice, or equity of piling into these projects millions upon millions of dollars each year for the benefit of a few people in the United States.

I have no objection whatever to the attempt to reclaim this land and to utilize it, and thereby add to the wealth of the Nation; but I do object to piling this money into these projects at the expense of the people, when but a very few of them will enjoy the benefits of it. In my judgment, it is unconscionable, unjust, inequitable, and absolutely unfair to tax the people of each and every congressional district to float a proposition at the expense of the many for the benefit of the few. I can not bring myself to a justification of it. An argument of tremendous force was made here the other day on this subject by the gentleman from Illinois. I tried to obtain an answer from some one who was defending and favoring the proposition, but they never answered me. If you propose to appropriate millions of dollars, without interest, for this purpose, why is not every congressional district represented upon the floor of this House entitled, on the same principle, to an equivalent amount of money to reclaim some land in that district? In my own county there is not less than 50,000 acres of wet land, as good land as the Lord ever created out of doors. The people there would give the Government all kinds of bonds for this money if they could only get it to reclaim that land without interest.

Mr. MADDEN. And they would be willing to pay some interest, too.

Mr. COX. Yes; and as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, they would be willing to pay a reasonable amount of interest to get it. Hence, as I said a moment ago, it can not be defended upon any economic ground, or any ground of justice and equality before the law.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield for a question.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman seems to assume that this only benefits the congressional district in which a project may be located. Now, is it not true that the reclamation laws are available to all of the people of the country, some of whom are represented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox]?

Mr. COX. But only a small number of people can avail themselves of it. It was argued here the other day that interest ought not to be charged, because when this project was begun in 1902 the law did not provide for the payment of interest. That is no reason why we ought not to amend the law. If we have tried out the law and found it to be a failure, or have found that it is working an injustice to the people, it is our duty and it is up to us to amend it so as to make it a law of equality.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. For a question.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, this section to which the gentleman's amendment is offered applies only to those who hereafter enter upon the reclaimed land.

Mr. COX. That is true.

Mr. MANN. It does not apply to anyone who has heretofore entered?

Mr. COX. That is the proposition.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. Does it not apply to anyone who applies for the benefit—

Mr. COX. Hereafter.

Mr. FALCONER. Hereafter, but under the enterprises already started and where the money has been expended for ditches?

Mr. COX. I think not.

Mr. FALCONER. Does it not, as a matter of fact?

Mr. COX. But I would go back and amend the law. I would make it apply to every one of these projects that was begun in 1902 or at any time prior to the passage of this law.

But to repeat, Mr. Chairman, if this is to be encouraged solely upon the ground that the law, when it was originally passed, did not provide for an interest charge, and if it is found that interest ought to be charged upon these payments, it is our duty to amend the law. It is special legislation, pure and simple. Why, ever since 1864, national banks which were made Government depositories have had the use every year of countless millions of dollars of the people's money, and it was not until 1912 that they were required to pay interest upon those deposits, and the Treasury Department has figured out that at 2 per cent interest on daily balances that would have yielded upward of \$80,000,000 to the revenues of this country. And during the period of time the Government charged 2 per cent interest on daily deposits it yielded nearly \$2,000,000 annually to the Government. This is a loan, pure and simple, to the farmers living on these projects, and why not make them pay a small rate on money advanced to them by the Government?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee to allow me to speak for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure and the honor of serving on the Irrigation Committee of this House when the original irrigation bill was written, and since that time I have taken some interest in this class of legislation.

I would like to see this great work succeed. I think there were some defects in the original bill, which perhaps should be amended; but I do not concur at all in the argument that has just been made by the gentleman from Indiana. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, whom are we asking to pay this interest? Are they the great corporations of this country? Is it the wealth of this country? Is it well-to-do people? No; we are asking a lot of people who have been unable to buy a home for themselves up to this time, who are invited to the West for a free home, many of whom have been living in sand and dirt for years, without schools, without water, without houses in which to take care of themselves and their families, and battling on this naked desert for a living [applause], in order that some day they may have what God should give to every man on this earth—a home for himself and family. [Applause.] I would like to ask the Members of this House who do not live in the arid West, when you appropriate and spend \$50,000,000 a year for rivers and harbors, does everybody in this country and in every congressional district get a part of that money? No. Do you ask the people who are benefited to pay interest on that money which you appropriate to make rivers and harbors navigable? No. Do you ask them to return the principal? No.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I decline to yield now. You do not require the money you spend for river and harbor service to be returned. You maintain a row of locks and canals from Pittsburgh down the Ohio River at the expense of my constituency and at the expense of your constituency who never use the Ohio River for navigation, and yet you give them the principal without interest.

This money does not come from the Public Treasury raised by taxation. It is a part of the private purse of the Nation. It has been so construed since the beginning of this Government. It is not subject to the same constitutional limitation on expenditures that has been recognized as Government money that goes into the Treasury by taxation.

What have you done with the money from the public domain in years past? You gave it away. In the early history of the country you gave away the public domain for homes. Is that what you are doing now—giving it away for homes? No; you are only lending the public domain to the homestead settler to make him pay for water on the arid desert. [Applause.] And you ask that these people should be charged interest. You gave the public domain to the great railroads of this country. Did you ask them to return the principal or interest? No.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this contract was entered into with these people many years ago. Instead of saying we give to so many people of the United States so many free homesteads, we said we give to the Secretary of the Treasury as trustee the public domain in 18 arid-land States that he may assemble that money

and use it for the purpose of making grass grow where no grass could grow before, to build homes where homes could not be built before, and then open it to homestead settlement. As a matter of fact, what is the difference in the proposition between opening the great plains of Ohio and Indiana and Illinois and giving homes to your fathers or taking a part of the public domain and expending it in a way so that you may give homes to your children? [Applause.]

I think this bill should be amended. I intend to support some of the amendments; but I say, Mr. Chairman, that when we gave the public domain to the great railroads of this country, gave them to the schools of the East, I am not prepared to agree that when there is a band of ragged, homeless, poor settlers fighting for their homesteads on the desert domain we should play the part of Shylock and ask for the pound of flesh. [Applause.]

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman—
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] is recognized.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the amendment I am impelled to express my appreciation, which is very hearty, indeed, of the able and eloquent remarks made by the justly distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the worthy floor leader of the majority, in opposition to interest charge. I congratulate the gentleman from Alabama on his very comprehensive grasp of the question and his correct conceptions of conditions in the semiarid West with which water users have to contend. I personally appreciate, and am sure the home builders of the semiarid West will highly appreciate, his effort made in behalf of their just cause.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment requiring the payment of interest. It is thoroughly repugnant to the spirit of the original reclamation act. Its enactment, in my judgment, would constitute a breach of faith with the people of the great semiarid West. But I now wish to express my views only as to the economic or business side of the question. I regard it as a saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung. Perhaps I have forgotten the language of the old fireside expression, but I remember the wisdom it contains.

To explain my meaning, there would be a loss to the public many times as much by deferring the development of semiarid lands as there would be gained by the Government in interest. There would be many times as much lost in the way of agricultural production by the delay of 5 or 10 years in opening up the lands to cultivation as the Government would gain in interest.

Mr. Chairman, to be better understood, the more money that is to be paid the longer it will take water users to make it out of the lands, and in proportion to the amount of interest required to be paid it would be necessary to extend the time limit beyond 20 years in which to make full payment of interest and principal. I understand the advocates of interest charge grant this proposition and would willingly extend the time limit of payment 10 years or more in addition to the 20 years' limit provided by the bill if their demand for interest payment be yielded. But as the amendment provides that interest be paid annually we will assume that but five years' delay would be caused in the development of 3,000,000 more acres, assuming that new entries would continue as if there were no interest charge, but which I do not think would prove true. I regard it as a fair estimate that the gross production per acre of these lands under a good system of irrigation would average at least \$50 an acre. The gross production then of 3,000,000 acres would amount to \$150,000,000 per year. For five years the gross production would amount to \$750,000,000. The farmer water user ought to secure a net return out of this gross production of, say, \$20 per acre per year, which would amount to \$60,000,000 for 3,000,000 acres. For five years it would amount to \$300,000,000. I should have stated the cost of construction, and therefore water-right charge, on 3,000,000 acres at \$50 per acre amounts to \$150,000,000. Interest at the rate of 3 per cent for one year upon \$150,000,000 amounts to \$4,500,000. For five years it would amount to \$22,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, this shows that while the Government would be gaining \$22,500,000 in interest, the semiarid West would lose at the same time in production \$750,000,000. As our agricultural production is now about equalled by our home consumption, it is fair to assume that \$750,000,000 worth of farm products raised in the semiarid West might save the necessity of the importation from foreign countries of an equal amount of farm products. But, Mr. Chairman, what would become meanwhile of existing water users? As a matter of course, most of them would fail. Not only this, the operation of the reclamation law would fail for the want of new entrymen for new projects and for new units on existing projects. As I have heretofore argued, the undertaking of water users will not en-

sure an interest charge. It would be too much like doing business on a watered-stock basis. Unless they can commence and get started on a basis that will permit of their making a living, securing reasonable returns for their labor, they must sooner or later fall in the entries they make.

Mr. Chairman, I propose now to demonstrate by a correct mathematical calculation I have made how this interest amendment would operate in a concrete case like the North Platte project, where the average amount of the water-right charge remaining unpaid is a little over \$50 per acre. Why, for the first few years interest payments would exceed the amount of the principal required to be paid by this bill. On this project, as the bill provides, the average payment of principal for the first year would be \$83.02, while the interest payment would be \$124.53, thus exceeding the principal payment by \$41.51. And yet this is a relief bill. For the second year, as the bill provides, the principal payment would be \$83.02 and the interest payment \$122.04.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman talked for three-quarters of an hour the other day, and I think he is imposing upon this side of the House. I shall have to object.

Mr. MANN. Oh, he is the ranking Republican on the committee.

Mr. DONOVAN. He talked for three-quarters of an hour the other day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, continuing with my estimate, for the third year the bill requires the payment of \$83.02 principal, while the interest amendment would require the payment of \$119.54. The fourth year the principal required to be paid by the bill would amount to \$83.02, while the interest amendment offered would require the payment of \$117.06. The fifth year the principal required to be paid by the bill would amount to \$166.04, while the interest amendment offered would require the payment of \$114.56.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record the written estimate I hold, showing how the act would operate with the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] requiring the payment of interest at 3 per cent.

But, Mr. Chairman, the result of the operation of the act with the interest amendment adopted would be to require the water user on such a project as the North Platte project to pay \$18.66 per acre more for his water right than without interest payment. Interest payment on an 80-acre unit in the North Platte project at 3 per cent would amount to \$1,491.68. Is this the way to afford relief when it is so greatly needed? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Year of payment.	Payments on account of principal.		Payments on account of interest at 3 per cent.	Total payments, principal and interest.
	Rate.	Amount.		
	Per cent.			
First.....	2	\$83.02	\$124.53	\$207.55
Second.....	2	83.02	122.04	205.06
Third.....	2	83.02	119.54	202.56
Fourth.....	2	83.02	117.06	200.08
Fifth.....	4	166.04	114.56	280.60
Sixth.....	4	166.04	102.58	278.62
Seventh.....	6	249.06	104.60	353.66
Eighth.....	6	249.06	97.12	346.20
Ninth.....	6	249.06	89.64	338.72
Tenth.....	6	249.06	82.18	331.26
Eleventh.....	6	249.06	74.67	323.75
Twelfth.....	6	249.06	67.23	316.31
Thirteenth.....	6	249.06	59.77	308.85
Fourteenth.....	6	249.06	52.29	301.37
Fifteenth.....	6	249.06	44.83	293.91
Sixteenth.....	6	249.06	37.35	286.43
Seventeenth.....	6	249.06	29.88	278.96
Eighteenth.....	6	249.06	22.40	271.48
Nineteenth.....	6	249.06	14.94	264.02
Twentieth.....	6	249.06	7.47	256.47
Total.....		\$4,151.20	1,491.68	5,642.88

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, what is the question before us? It is a question now of whether we are going to establish irrigation projects or reclaim lands on a business basis, or whether we are going to reclaim the lands and hand them over to settlers without any relation to what the business of the situation is. In 1902 we began this work. In 1903 we had expended \$268,000; in 1904 we had expended \$1,781,000; in 1905, \$5,548,100; in 1906, \$12,632,900; in 1907, \$25,008,800; in 1908, \$36,253,200; in 1909, \$45,757,900; in 1910, \$53,781,300; in 1911, \$60,940,800; in 1912, \$69,858,200; in 1913, \$76,233,000; and in 1914, \$83,588,200. The interest which would have accrued on that amount of money, if we charged at the rate of 3 per cent, up to the 30th of June, 1914, would have been \$14,150,664. And all the money that has been paid in by the settlers up to the present time is less than one-third of what the accrued interest on the sum that has been expended would amount to.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I refuse to yield. What are we doing? We are developing arid lands. We are endeavoring to make them settleable for the people who want homes in the West. We are investing at the rate of \$60 an acre for the development of the water that may be turned onto these lands so as to make them cultivable. We are investing in the 3,000,000 acres of land proposed to be developed under the law now in existence about \$200,000,000. We are paying this money from the sale of public lands all over the Union, and we are turning that money into the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, carte blanche, to expend as he pleases.

When we have these \$200,000,000 we are giving the land that is developed by that expenditure to the people who want to settle there. How much do we charge them for the land? Not a cent. Is it fair to assume that when we give this land to these people to settle there, free, after the expenditure of \$200,000,000, there ought not to be any interest charged? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the distinguished leader of the Democratic side of the House, said that we do not charge interest to the people who get the benefits from developments of rivers and harbors. Of course we do not. There is no comparison between the two propositions. Who owns the rivers and harbors after the money is expended on the development? The people of the United States. Who owns the land that these people settle on after we have expended our \$200,000,000 for their settlement? The people that settle on the land, and nobody else. The man who owns 160 acres of land there is the sole beneficiary. The gentleman from Alabama says we do not charge the people interest on the money invested in the Life-Saving Service for lighthouses. Who owns the lighthouses? Who controls them? Who has a title to them? Does any individual in the United States own them or have title to them? Not at all. Why should anybody pay interest on the investment? Who owns the land all over the United States? The men who toll on the farms. Who loans them money without interest? Nobody. Is there land anywhere in the United States that needs development or reclaiming? Yes; there are millions of acres down on the Mississippi River. There is just as much reason for saying that we ought to reclaim the lands on the Mississippi River, where we have an alluvial soil, so rich that there is not anything like it in all the world, as there is for reclaiming land elsewhere. Why not reclaim that? Why not give the people of Mississippi and all the border States along the Mississippi Valley the benefit of the expenditure of this money for reclamation, where the land when reclaimed is worth something and where crops can be raised, regardless of whether waterways are built through which the water can flow upon the land? I see no reason on earth why this money should be expended by the Government of the United States without the payment of interest by those who receive the benefit. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID], the lightning calculator at mathematics, made the statement a moment ago that \$18.62 would be added to the price per acre of the land by the payment of the interest.

And I will say to the gentleman that the price of land is only \$60 for development, and only \$1.80 would be the amount of interest to be paid on the cost of an acre of land, so that I do not see where the gentleman gets \$18.60. The gentleman adds to that ten times—

Mr. FALCONER. That is for one year.

Mr. MADDEN. It is only \$1.80, or 3 per cent interest on \$60—

Mr. FALCONER. Per year.

Mr. MADDEN. I am willing to give all the time extension these people out there want for the payment of the cost of the development of this land, whether it is 20 years, 25 years, 30 years, 35 years, or 40 years, but they ought to be obliged to pay interest on the money expended by the Government for the development of the land. We have lots of lands in Illinois that can be developed, and we would be glad to have the Government of the United States furnish the money to develop them, and we would be glad to pay the United States Government interest on the money which it would loan us for that purpose. The people in the other States of the Union have lands that can be developed. Why not use part of this reclamation fund for their benefit? Why not use part of the reclamation fund that is being expended in such vast quantities for the development of lands where people are willing and able to pay interest? If the people of this section of the country are not able to pay interest on money advanced by the United States, the projects are not worth developing. If we are not able, after we have expended \$200,000,000 out of the Public Treasury, to assure ourselves that the land is worth settling upon, then we are not representing the American people with that degree of intelligence which they expected of us when they sent us here. It is our duty, we are obligated by our oath, to see that no dollar of the public money is expended extravagantly or unwisely or unjustly. We are obligated by our oath of office to see that every transaction performed by the Congress of the United States is so performed that it will stand the light of criticism, and I submit to you men here to-day that the expenditure of these \$200,000,000 for the development of these arid lands without the payment of interest by the men who now contemplate further development is not only unjust but indefensible.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I desire very briefly to express some thoughts which occurred to me while the gentleman who has just taken his seat was speaking. This is not a proposition to start anew this irrigation project and let the people pay the principal back, and, in addition to that, require them to pay interest. It is a project that was started many years ago. In its wisdom that earlier Congress considered this a great national enterprise and not merely for the local benefit of a few, and provided, what was at that time an unheard-of proposition, that the people who settled on these lands under these reclamation projects should pay the principal back in 10 years. The Government engineers mistook the time they could finish the work. The people who went on the lands, seeking and hungry for homes, were misled partly by these Government engineers and by their own hopefulness that they would get a home, and so undertook it. It is ascertained that unless the relief is given they will have to give up the enterprise almost in a body. Now and then you will find people who will survive, but the proposition before you to-day, nakedly stated, is this: Whether you will throw away that \$83,000,000 that the gentleman has added up here before you and abandon this enterprise, that has been on foot in this country for years, as an absolute failure, or whether you will give these poor settlers—and I know personally many of them are hungry, not merely for homes and for land, but hungry for the necessities of life for their wives and children—this opportunity to procure a home; and here we are met by gentlemen like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] and others on the floor of the House by the proposition, "You must starve or quit the proposition," a proposition as to which the Government made as much of a mistake as these people have made. Gentlemen on this floor say these settlers may starve or quit the proposition, and we will accept the loss of \$83,000,000 and abandon the enterprise. Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell, that is what is to be decided now, namely, shall the Government lose the millions already invested by placing the additional burden of an interest charge on the settler and thus forcing him to give up and abandon his claim? [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that these settlers should be required to pay interest upon the money invested in this land. The Government is going to expend about \$60 an acre in placing water upon it. It was originally estimated that about \$30,000,000 would be realized from the sale of public lands in the arid and semiarid States, but from 1901 to 1913 \$80,901,000 was realized. It was all expended, and the \$20,000,000 authorized to be obtained by the issuance of certificates of indebtedness has also been expended, and it is estimated that it will take \$100,000,000 additional to complete the works now in progress. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations made an investigation this winter of the Reclamation Service. They prepared a synopsis of the testimony taken before that committee, and in the synopsis, signed by Mr. BORLAND, of Missouri, Mr. WHITE, of Ohio, Mr. CARR, of

Pennsylvania, and Mr. MAHAN, of Connecticut, the statement is made "that the evidence indicates that a greater percentage of the land under irrigation projects is still in the hands of speculators, only the smaller fractions being in the possession of actual settlers." What will this House be confronted with in a very short time? Legislation to provide a system of rural credits. All over this country in the rural sections there is a demand that some system be devised by the Federal Government by which the farmer can more readily borrow money in order to finance the operations of his farm. If Congress determines to expend over \$200,000,000 in making lands in the arid and semiarid regions available for cultivation, donating them merely upon the reimbursement to the Federal Government over a period of 15 years of the principal without interest, what defense can there be to the proposition that a system be devised whereby the lowly owner of some farm property at some place in the country, who might profitably till his farm and sustain himself in decency if he had \$5,000 or \$10,000 worth of improvements upon it, be financed by the Federal Government to make those improvements with a requirement that opportunity be given to repay the principal in 15 or 20 years without interest?

What answer can be made to the farming community of this country if we are to make tillable and possible of cultivation Government lands and give them to the men seeking them merely upon a return of the investment necessary to make them profitable over a period of 15 years, when the man who has the land himself asks that the Federal Government advance him for 15 years or 10 years or 5 years enough money to make it possible for him to put his farm in shape, so that he can make profitable returns from it and not be compelled to pay interest upon the investment required?

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I believe that this is one of the gravest questions the House has been compelled to confront in a long time. There will be rural-credit legislation after a very brief period. There is a universal sentiment in this country for it. It will be necessary to exercise the utmost care and take the greatest precautions to evolve a system that will be fair to those seeking extensions of credit along such lines without doing an injustice to the rest of the people or without launching the Government upon a scheme of financial operations that may well tax to the limit the energies and the resources of the people to maintain. And yet, if we establish this precedent and invest the money taken from the Treasury, advance it to some one who takes these Government lands, letting them take a period of 15 years to return it without interest, we can never meet the demands that will be irresistibly made upon us.

This situation is not similar to the situations that have been referred to. The business, the great function of the Federal Government is to maintain aids to navigation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes more. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York ask unanimous consent for three minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is all I want.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A function of the Federal Government is to maintain a lighthouse service as an essential aid to the safe navigation of the navigable waters over which the Government has control. A function of the Federal Government is to improve the navigable waters so that they may be safely navigated and so as to provide competitive rates and facilities with the great transportation systems of the country in order that those who have products to ship, as well as those who desire to purchase them, will not have imposed upon them burdens for transportation beyond all reason. The Life-Saving Service is somewhat similar. It might as well be said that the people of the seaboard should be compelled in some way to pay interest on the money expended to maintain a navy, because in no possible way from one standpoint does the interior of the country benefit from it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have only three minutes.

Or it might be said that a city, a great commercial center on the seaboard, should be compelled to pay interest on the amount expended for the coast defenses, because that particular place is defended and some point in the interior is not.

But those situations are not at all analogous to this one. Here is Government land, with persons taking it up for settlement under the law, the Government advancing the money to

finance the improvement and development of the same. All that is asked is that there shall be returned principal and interest. I am not particular about the rate of interest, whether it be 3 per cent or 2 per cent. But let us establish as a policy of the Government that it will advance without interest the money necessary to finance those operations essential to make possible the development of lands taken from the Government, and there can not be any answer to the demand that every farmer in the United States owning his own land shall have advanced to him out of the Federal Treasury such sum as might properly be loaned upon his property for a term of years for the development of that land, to be returned after a period of years without any interest. If we launch into this policy now, we can not avoid the other, and as good, sound business men we should not do so.

Two hundred million dollars is projected in these schemes. Is it not enough that the resources of the country should be taxed to such an extent so as to enable men to settle upon and take up these lands, without asking the Federal Treasury to bear the burden of sustaining them? Mr. Chairman, it is said that this money is not taken out of the Treasury. We own a great public domain, an asset of the Federal Government, and it is provided by law that the proceeds of the sales of public lands in the arid and semiarid States shall be put into this reclamation fund and spent for the improvement and development of the land in the arid and semiarid States. Can it be said that is not taken out of the Treasury? If it had not been for that law, the money would have been turned into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and counted in the grand total necessary to provide the money to pay the expenses of the Government. To the extent of \$80,000,000 the general funds of the Treasury have been depleted because the proceeds of these sales have been turned into the reclamation fund. We have borrowed \$138,000,000 to help defray the cost of the building of the Panama Canal, paying interest on \$84,000,000 at 2 per cent and fifty and odd million dollars at 3 per cent. If this money had not been diverted from the general funds of the Treasury and segregated in this reclamation fund, the country would not to-day be paying interest on \$80,000,000 of the bonds issued for that purpose. It surely is a charge upon the Federal Treasury. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to these amendments and opposed to the payment of any interest on the deferred payments. I would like to call this matter to the attention of the House in a little different way than it has been presented relative to the question of interest. I trust that the Members from the Middle West, and the East, and the South will not be driven off their feet upon the question that the farmer is ready and willing to pay a reasonable interest upon a loan on his land in order that he may develop it. These men in the East in former generations were given this land like those who are struggling in the West. The present generation and the generation before have inherited this, with good homes, good roads, good towns, and you can now well afford to go into improving the country in which you live.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield just now.

In the Middle West you have turned over a greater part of this domain to the railroad companies, and they took the best there was. I want to impress upon the mind of every man from the South and the East that for the last 40 years this Government, in its wisdom, has had upon the statute books laws that have given to these men free land and free water. A man living in the West knows what that means. He has taken his homestead, he has taken his desert land, and he gets his water without any cost to him. For 40 years of this selecting of the public domain it has taken the water without any expense. We find great empires of land that is not susceptible of use, not susceptible of men living upon it, without irrigation. This Congress in its wisdom, some eight years ago, believed that we should go, not to the Public Treasury, that we should not tax any man a dollar, but to the public-domain States and take the funds received from the sale of that land and turn them over to the Government that they might build it up, that they might put the remaining public domain in the position in which the greater part had been placed, namely, with good land and water.

And you find the people in that condition now, where, by virtue of the Government's energy, by virtue of the knowledge, by virtue of the brains and ability that this Government has gath-

ered together in the Reclamation Service, hundreds of thousands of acres of the public domain have been reclaimed by private individuals, and that fund has been put into the fund of the Reclamation Service, that otherwise would not be there to-day. By virtue of the same energy and work, the Carey Act and the other acts have been put forward, and thousands of dollars have been put into the reclamation fund and into the Treasury for the reclamation fund, for the purpose of continuing to build up these tracts of land that were absolutely worthless and upon which human nature could not exist.

Now, after you have started these men on the road for eight years and have held out the hopes to them that they might be treated like those in the East, that they might have water brought to their land, that a larger fund might be placed in the Treasury of the United States, that the Government might receive its price from the land, and that all the other lands might be sold and this land used for the purpose of developing and enhancing the remaining public land, after you have given this attention and started it, you say you want to place this interest upon this investment, when the Government is trying to put it in the same shape as the rest of the land that it has given away.

In practically all the projects, by virtue of the high cost of material and the high cost of everything, by additions to the projects, they have doubled and quadrupled in cost, not by any fault of the men on the ground, but because of necessity. You said they should have 10 years' time in which to pay back this money. Is it anything more than right and fair that they should be given an extra time of 10 years more in which they could pay back to this Government the money? Unquestionably no.

Some one has intimated, some one has been unkind enough to say, that the Government will not get back this money. Anyone who has read the case of Shirley against Baker, the case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, knows that the maintenance fund and the upkeep fund has all been or will be paid back by these farmers.

The entire amounts that go into this fund are to return to the United States, and as a result after 10 years, as the law now stands, and under this bill 20 years, these men will pay back into the Treasury of the United States every dollar of money that has been expended, and the Government is not out one cent. You have the money in the Treasury instead of having barren wastes of land out there unused and unprovided for. Is there anybody injured? Can these men in the East and in the South—and I know there are only a few—say, "Why, my home was taken up as a homestead or preemption 50 years ago, and I wish you had loaned me money on my place to improve it and better it"? There is no comparison nor analogy between the cases at all, and it is only a question of treating these men in the proper shape, dealing with them as you would deal with an ordinary business man. There is not a business man in this House that does not know—and it is done every day—that when a man finds that he has his money invested and finds that his mortgagee can not possibly come out whole he not only reduces the principal in some instances, but in pretty nearly all of them he reduces the interest.

The Government has held out the hope to these people in the West. You have invited them there with this understanding, that they would pay no interest upon the money invested. All you have asked of them—and they have agreed to it—is that they will pay it back at stated times, as it is now in 10 equal installments of the money invested, first, the absolute amount of the construction of the dam, and, second, the money paid for the upkeep and maintenance of the entire project.

This bill, in addition to the first section—and I want to call your attention to it, so that there may be no misunderstanding—provides that each man that comes under the present projects must agree, or he can not get the benefit of the 20 years' time, that he will comply with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. This is a law that will make it better for the Government and make it better for the individual to have it in that way rather than as it is at the present time.

Why, we talk about the various projects that the Government has benefited. It has been fully explained and gone into as to the construction of harbors. You are ready and willing to improve them. You are ready and willing to improve the rivers, but you have a million acres of land with water at a long distance, and you have said now that by an expenditure of the money from these same lands and others of like character and lands from the Western States, "We will take that land, we will impound that water, and we will use it for the purpose of putting the land in shape so that it is habitable and that a man may use it." It is a benefit to the Government, and you have

thus improved that million acres of land. You have placed 10,000 families upon that tract of land. You have enhanced the wealth of this country by ten or twenty million dollars, and by virtue of direct and indirect taxation you are benefiting the States and you are benefiting this Nation by doing it.

And now at this time can it be possible that this Congress would change its plan and its policy and say to these men, after their hardships and struggles, that more burden should be placed upon them? I think not. This House will not require this extra burden. There is enough now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, and Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent to proceed, but I believe there is an understanding that I shall have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see this country populated and colonized wherever there is available land. I believe it would be well if we could encourage a more general distribution of the people. In some large cities undoubtedly there are those who would be better off if they went into the country districts or even into the far West. But they ought not to go upon arid or semiarid lands if they are to make dead failures of their lives or to take upon themselves, without an adequate return, the very great hardships that have been referred to in this debate. Moreover, there ought to be no misrepresentation, either upon the part of the Government or upon the part of private speculators, to induce men to leave the East or any other section of the country to go upon arid or semiarid lands if they are to be made to suffer as has been stated here.

I would not oppose the extension of the time that has been allotted to those who in good faith have already taken up these arid lands and who are now waiting for irrigation and the development of the crops, through which they hope to make good their contract. I sympathize keenly with those who are thus embarrassed, more especially if their misfortune had been due to misrepresentation or false pretense upon the part of speculators.

SETTLERS MUST GO IN TO MAKE GOOD.

But we are now about to make a new contract, and I believe, in the light of experience, that the time has come to give notice to every man who in good faith intends to go upon this land hereafter that he goes in with his eyes open and must no longer expect to fall back upon the bounty of the Government; that he goes in with a definite understanding that at the expiration of the time of the contract he must make good; that if 10 years is the limit, that is the limit, and it is the end of the contract.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those who have already gone in may not have sought to go in as the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] insists. They may have gone in upon representations made to them that were misleading and unfair; but having gotten in, there may be no earthly way for them to get out except by extending their time. I repeat I sympathize with those who are already in, but that is no reason why others should be induced to go in with them.

NO DISCRIMINATION IN FAVOR OF EAST.

The gentleman from California seems to think the eastern farmer has been favored as against the farmer who staked his chances upon this irrigated land. He can not compare this situation with anything that has prevailed in the experience of the early eastern pioneer. Neither can the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], whose eloquence swayed the House a little while ago, because those men who carved out their homes on the farms and through the forests of the East had no such subsidy, no such governmental inducement, as has been made to the 11,000 farmers who have gone in under these irrigation schemes. While their lives may have been hard—and I am sure they were—the irrigation farmer had the advantage of Government aid, which the eastern farmer never had. They have been especially favored in this respect. No such expenditure for a like number of farmers has ever been made by the Government as has been made in support of these reclamation projects, and the eastern farmer, in particular, never had any such financial or paternalistic assistance.

MILLIONS TO BENEFIT A FEW.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I regret I can not, because my time is so limited. The best figures we have show that the farmers who have been induced, by circularizing or otherwise, to go out of the East onto the arid lands number 11,320. Give each of them a family of five and that makes 55,000 people who are the beneficiaries of this system, or the victims of it, either one or the other. That means about as many people in all of these 17 arid-land States as the number of residents in one ward in the city of Boston, or in the city of Philadelphia, or in the city of New York. Eleven thousand farmers means about as many farmers as there are in the district of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], or any other gentleman who represents a farming district not in arid or semiarid territory. And whether it be Government money or not, it is Government land we appropriate. Thus far we have spent for these 11,000 farmers \$86,000,000. Make a mental or pencil calculation, and you will find that the inducement made to these pioneers who are carving their way through these arid lands and this sagebrush is approximately \$7,500 per farm. I would like some gentleman from Indiana or some gentleman from Illinois or some gentleman from Ohio to rise and say whether any one of his pioneer farmers, whose record he now looks back to with pride as son and heir, ever had such assistance offered to him by the Government? Answer, you up in North Dakota; answer, you down in Texas, whether the Government ever started you in business with the dead-sure promise that it would spend \$7,500 upon 40 acres of land.

Mr. FALCONER. Oh, no; \$60 an acre.

Mr. MOORE. Forty acres of land is about the limit of the farm unit under an irrigation scheme, as shown by these tables.

A LONG WAIT FOR RESULTS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We sell land on 40 years' time at 4 and 5 per cent interest.

Mr. MOORE. My sympathies are with those men who have gone on these lands. I do not care whether they have come from foreign lands or not; if they have gone out there from the East I wish them Godspeed in what they are undertaking to do. I have seen some of them who have persisted there for three, four, and five years, and the testimony of the gentlemen who have spoken for them indicates that some of them have labored in this sagebrush territory, waiting for their trees to come to fruition and their crops to develop for six, seven, and eight years, living meanwhile on canned goods and at times without fresh vegetables. If these people have been taken in and wronged, we should not encourage others.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the gentleman say they live on canned goods on a farm?

Mr. MOORE. I venture to say the gentleman will find enough tin cans on these remote farms of his State to roof every shack in the irrigated district.

Mr. BRYAN. Nobody lives on canned goods, without vegetables, on our farms.

Mr. MOORE. I do not accuse the gentleman himself of living on canned goods. The gentleman lives on the fat of the land.

Mr. BRYAN. The people out in my State have plenty of vegetables.

WATERWAY IMPROVEMENTS BRING REVENUE.

Mr. MOORE. I hope they have, but the gentleman is taking my time. Now, the East has been assailed in this debate because, like the West, the Middle West, and the South, it is striving to obtain improvements to its rivers and harbors. The East has been accused of robbing the Government in the matter of appropriations. Why, the eastern ports produce 80 per cent of all the revenue of this Government that comes in from the customhouses. It is entitled to river and harbor appropriations, because it has been sadly neglected. There is no justification, so far as it is concerned, for the holding up of the river and harbor bill in the filibuster that is now being conducted at the other end of this Capitol. The East has nothing to apologize for in its relations to the West. Go into Seattle, go into the gentleman's own town in Washington, and when the question is asked as to land values, even the boom values that prevail there, "Where does this money come from?" you will find that it comes out of the East. We have sent you money to build your railroads and put you on your feet, while we have suffered a lack of transportation facilities. And you have been legislating to get more of it.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to say that we are sending money to the East all the time.

Mr. MOORE. It would be very welcome in view of what your party has done to us.

Mr. BRYAN. You have got it.

Mr. MOORE. And I guess we pay for it. Under recent legislative conditions we will be glad to have all you send, if we can get anybody to take the risk of running our factories.

Mr. BRYAN. We have recently quit sending it to New York, IMPROVED FARMS IN EAST AT SMALL COST.

Mr. MOORE. Some time ago, Mr. Chairman, the question of farm values was raised in this House, and there were some who expressed surprise when the statement was made that those who were going out on the arid plains and cleaning up sagebrush, which cost from \$25 to \$110 an acre to improve for irrigation, might do a little better and do it a little quicker if they looked down the Mississippi Valley and stayed there, or if they looked over the Atlantic coast and remained there. We have some pride in keeping our farmers at home. Nor is it fair that those who go West or anywhere else should be deceived as to what they are to get. The sagebrush farm may be very productive, but it takes seven or eight years for crops to come into bearing. Over along the Atlantic coast we can sell farms, irrigated by nature, with houses on them, for the price of constructing the irrigating and supply works in the arid region.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PERTINENT REVENUE FIGURES.

Mr. MOORE. In view of the attacks that have been made upon the East, and without desiring to be unfair or invidious, I insist that a comparison of the revenues raised in the various States for the support of the Union would leave very little ground for those who assail the East to stand upon. Such a comparison would prove conclusively in the matter of appropriations that the East is not only self-sacrificing but unfairly liberal to other sections of the country. Gentlemen have complained of river and harbor appropriations to eastern projects. These have been almost ludicrously low, in view of the returns that come back to the country through the rivers and harbors sought to be improved. New York, for instance, collects \$225,000,000 of Federal revenue, while Pennsylvania contributes \$46,000,000 and Massachusetts \$35,000,000. New York State has paid as much for its own waterways, which benefit the entire country, as the Federal Government has spent upon all the ports and rivers of the Atlantic seaboard. Massachusetts and Pennsylvania have not received back from the Government in a hundred years as much as they turn into the Government every year. Maryland contributes to the Federal Government every year \$13,000,000, while the Government has not given it more than \$10,000,000 for rivers and harbors in 100 years. New Jersey contributes \$10,000,000 every year to the Federal Government, and in return therefor has not received for rivers and harbors more than \$7,000,000 in 100 years.

ATTACKS UPON EAST WITHOUT FOUNDATION.

I am in favor of colonizing and upbuilding the 17 arid and semiarid land States, but I am safe in saying that the internal revenue derived by the Government from all of them is not equal to that derived from Pennsylvania, nor is it much greater than that derived from the State of New Jersey alone. When our friends indulge in their attacks upon the East they ought to put these figures alongside of the \$86,000,000 we have already spent to irrigate land for 11,000 farmers. And they should indulge us a little further when we venture the suggestion that there is still a vast quantity of improved and unimproved land in the Mississippi Valley and along the Atlantic seaboard that could be purchased at prices per acre far below the cost of installing irrigation plants in arid territory.

EAST FULL OF OPPORTUNITY.

Without reflecting upon the work of irrigation, nor upon the desirability of reclaiming arid and semiarid lands, I wish to quote from an address made by the Hon. Frank E. Howe, lieutenant governor of Vermont, made at the Jacksonville convention of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association in November, 1913. Speaking from personal knowledge of fertile lands in Florida and also in the State of Vermont, he said:

Both are States of few cities. The great area of Vermont and the great area of Florida are made up of land which is only partially developed, land which is only giving a part of what it ought to produce. You have all heard about the abandoned farms of New England. Now, as a matter of fact, there are very few farms in New England that are absolutely deserted, but there are thousands and tens of thousands that produce only a fraction of what they ought to give, because of sloth and inefficient ownership.

In Florida you have much the same condition, though you may call it by a different name. You have scratched the earth in a few garden spots like Lake Helen, Hastings, Fort Lauderdale, and Miami, of which we often hear, and in other places the names of which are not so familiar to us in the North; but all around these garden spots you have

areas just as fertile, waiting for the hand of labor and business judgment to develop them and bring forth their increase.

Vermont is in precisely the same predicament. Vermont produces more corn per acre than Illinois, more wheat per acre than Minnesota, more apples per tree than Oregon, more butter per cow than Iowa, and yet Vermont farms go begging at from \$15 to \$25 an acre.

I have spoken of Vermont and Florida, but privately and confidentially I want to tell you that the same condition exists in every Eastern State. You have got your cities; you are proud of their progress. But in order to develop the country and make it progressive as a whole, and make it do what it ought to do, you have got to reach these back areas, these areas which are not doing what they ought to do in adding to the prosperity and progress of the United States. You may say that all this has no part in a waterways convention; but it has. You may say that the cattle grower from Kissimmee cares nothing about the Haritan Canal; you may say the tinner on the Hudson River or in the Connecticut Valley or the Merrimac Valley knows or cares nothing about the tinner on the James. Perhaps once he did not, but at this time he does, for the completion of this waterways system is of interest to every citizen of every State.

Every State is a partner of every other State in the progress of our country. The completion of this proposed Atlantic waterways system will not only save our people millions in transportation charges, it will add millions of wealth through the development of our fertile areas, it will increase by millions the value of our real estate, and it will save thousands of human lives now lost on our wind-swept and treacherous coasts.

EAST FURNISHED MEN AND MONEY TO THE WEST.

Now, there is no special reason for rejecting Horace Greeley's advice to "Go west." Every true American admires the pioneer who blazed the way through the trackless forests and over the unbeaten mountain paths to settle and develop the West. The western type of citizenship and the western genius for hustle in business and for appropriations in Congress excites our interest if not our admiration. But our western friends who have taken an aggressive part in this discussion have no good reason for chiding the East. The East is neither effete nor is it done as an agricultural community. While we have been giving away our western lands and every inducement has been made to the settler to go in upon them, the heaviest draft has been made upon the East. It has furnished the men and the money, and in doing so it has neglected many of its own opportunities, transportation facilities and waterways improvements being among them. But just as the lieutenant governor of Vermont has observed, it has overlooked its own farms, it has not made that bid for settlers that has characterized other sections of the country.

MANY FARMS NEAR THE LARGE CITIES.

People talk of congestion in the East. We have congestion in the large cities, but within 25 miles of most of them, along neglected rivers or otherwise close to the market, there are ample productive farms for any existing surplus population. Read the real estate advertisements in any of the metropolitan sheets and ample evidence is forthcoming of farm opportunities that challenge the per-acre prices that hold in the Middle West and that make amazing to the average eastern man the story of the pioneer who enters arid or semiarid territory to wait for years until his efforts shall bring forth any return whatever. If irrigation that requires so much time and patience costs for construction only from \$25 to \$110 per acre, what shall we say of improved farms awaiting the tiller near great cities as described in these sample advertisements?

Near West Chester, Pa.:

One hundred and seventy-five acres—A farm at a speculation price, only \$50 per acre. Main line P. R. R. Desirable stock, grain, and fruit farm; large stone dwelling; large stone barn; new wagon house; two springs, with spring houses; spring water by gravity; woodland; beautiful views.

In Montgomery County, Pa.:

Sixty acres, close to Norristown and Pottstown trolley, with stone house, eight rooms; good barn and outbuildings; plenty fruit and grain planted; close to best of markets; \$50 per acre; \$1,000 worth of cedar posts; terms.

In the Perkiomen Valley, Pa.:

Seventy-five acres, \$2,800, only \$1,200 cash, balance easy terms; large eight-room stone house, bank barn, necessary outbuildings; two fine springs, spring house; near creamery, stores, school, etc.; some crops included; all clean, tillable, machine-worked fields; immediate possession.

EASTERN FARM OPPORTUNITIES.

These are but a few advertisements from a Philadelphia paper of to-day, but I venture to say that from \$25 to \$50 per acre would buy improved land in sufficient quantities to accommodate all of the 11,000 farmers who are striving for success upon these western irrigation projects in any of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, or Virginia, or in either of the Carolinas. It is not generally known, but it ought to be, in the interests of the East as well as of the entire country, that nearly half of the tillable land of the thirteen original States is still available for the man who is seeking a home upon the farm.

Most of the manufactories of the country are in the Eastern States and in the old colonial area, but it is likewise true that some of the States east of the Appalachian chain have the greatest agricultural records in certain lines of production. The

richest county in productivity in the United States is Lancaster, Pa. In buckwheat production Pennsylvania excels. It is not very far behind in dairy products. New York, Maine, and Pennsylvania rank one, two, three as potato raisers, while the duplicated crops of Florida are the marvel of the country.

That the East may not lose its status in agriculture, I call attention to a very remarkable statement in a carefully prepared address by the former Director of the Census, Mr. E. Dana Durand, at Richmond, in 1911:

MORE STRIKING FIGURES.

Mr. Durand showed that the total area of farm land in the 13 original States in 1910 was 161,000,000 acres. Of this vast acreage only 83,000,000 were improved up to 1910, leaving 78,000,000 available for the settler. The figures of the then Director of the Census have such an important bearing upon the question now under consideration that I quote a portion of them, as follows:

Although during the first 60 years of our national existence the 13 original States developed much more rapidly in manufactures and commerce than in agriculture, nevertheless they showed a very marked development in agriculture also. No trustworthy agricultural statistics are available for the 13 original States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, or for many years thereafter; but it is certain that farm areas, value of farm property, and quantity and value of farm products steadily increased and were in 1850 several times greater than in 1790. Since 1850, however, there has been comparatively little increase in agriculture in the 13 original States, the growing demands for agricultural products being satisfied by the enormous development of regions farther west. The total area of farm land in the 13 original States in 1850 was 147,000,000 acres, while in 1910 it was only about 10 per cent greater, 161,000,000 acres. The acreage of improved land had increased somewhat more, from 64,000,000 acres in 1850 to 83,000,000 in 1910, or nearly one-third. In the area outside of the 13 original States, however, acreage of farm land increased from about 146,000,000 acres in 1850 to 713,000,000 in 1910, or over fivefold, and the acreage of improved land multiplied seven times. In 1850 the 13 original States had almost exactly one-half of the acreage of farm land and more than one-half of the acreage of improved land; in 1910 they had less than one-fifth of the total acreage and only a little over one-sixth of the improved acreage.

In striking contrast with these figures of agricultural industry in the thirteen original States are the figures for manufactures and commerce. While, of course, the percentage of increase in manufactures in the area outside of the thirteen original States has been much greater than within their area, the absolute amount of increase in the thirteen original States has exceeded the absolute amount of increase outside. In 1790 the total value of manufactured products for the entire United States—practically all being in the thirteen original States—was roughly estimated at \$20,000,000. In 1910 the value of products of manufacturing establishments of the thirteen original States was \$11,121,000,000, or nearly 600 times the figure for 120 years before. In 1850 the total value of products in the territory of the thirteen original States was \$800,000,000. The increase of the past 60 years in this territory has been more than \$10,300,000,000, the figure for 1910 being 14 times greater than that for 1850. While in the territory outside of the thirteen original States the value of manufactures between 1850 and 1910 multiplied nearly fifty-fold, the actual increase of about \$9,330,000,000 was less than the increase during the same period in the thirteen original States.

EAST MUST BE CONSIDERED.

Considering this data from an official source, it is scarcely to be wondered at that these available eastern lands should be passed over by pioneers for the confessedly hard and hazardous work of developing land by artificial irrigation. If the pioneer is able with reasonable assistance from the Government to make his work effective upon the arid or semiarid lands, well and good. But he should not go in without full knowledge of his responsibility, since the financial aid obtained under the irrigation plan is not available to the millions of other farmers who are working out the problems of successful agriculture in lands more fertile and less remote. Nor can any comprehensive or equitable plan of distribution and development, either of population or of agriculture, be successfully worked out without taking the East into consideration.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman to have the 10 minutes, but I think we ought to have some agreement about the time for debate upon this matter so that we will know who is going to speak.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that some agreement ought to be made as to time. I would like to see this bill got through.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I would like to see if we can not get some time for limit of debate. It has been running now nearly two hours.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not used any of that time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Can not we agree on 20 minutes on a side?

Mr. MONDELL. This is a very important amendment to this bill, and it seems to me that we ought to have a fair amount of debate on this one amendment.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I want to offer, and I want a few minutes on it.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, there are several Members on this side who were promised, on last Thursday, that they would be given time. Some of them are members of the committee.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman had better get debate closed on this amendment and amendments to the amendment, because if a quorum disappears I am going to keep the Members here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to see the bill got through and become a law.

Mr. MANN. So would I.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to see Members who are in favor of the bill help to get it closed up. Does not the gentleman from Colorado think that 20 minutes on a side is sufficient?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments to it close in 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to have 10 minutes. I can not complete what I have to say in less than that.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Here are some members of the committee that want to be heard.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let us make it an hour; there are other amendments besides this, and this is not the last call.

Mr. MONDELL. This is the last call on this amendment, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments to this amendment be closed in one hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Before that is agreed to I would like to ask whether it will be necessary to offer amendments to this amendment before the debate is closed or after?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. No. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, is the one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; one half by me and the other half by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. GORDON. I object to that.

Mr. MANN. No; it is to be controlled by the Chair.

Mr. DONOVAN. If the time is to be controlled by the Chair, the Chair will need to watch the gentleman from Wyoming somewhat in that respect.

Mr. MONDELL. "The gentleman from Wyoming" asked unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, and I believe I have been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has been recognized and asked unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. DONOVAN. I object, Mr. Chairman; 5 minutes is enough. The other day the gentleman got an extension of time and spent half of that time in foolish talk.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, other gentlemen have been discussing this question for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Connecticut, who knows nothing about it, has not seen fit to object.

Mr. DONOVAN. I object, Mr. Chairman, to more than 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is that the gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming has 10 minutes, has he not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asked unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Reserving the right to object, at the request of the gentleman from California, who rarely talks, and the gentleman from Wyoming, who hardly ever speaks, I am willing to withdraw my objection and allow them to talk for 10 minutes or 10 hours. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are presenting a bill proposing an extension of the period of payment on reclamation projects from 10 to 20 years. In connection with that extension of time the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] proposes that there shall be interest paid at the rate of 3 per cent. He bases his contention on the proposition that if we are to loan to farmers for the purchase and development of farms money taken from the Treasury of the United States we should, in justice to all the people, charge interest on the money so loaned and advanced. I would agree with the gentleman from Indiana absolutely, if that were the proposition presented to the House; but that is not the proposition before the House at all. We are not taking money from the Treasury raised by taxation, but

money received from the sale of public lands, and we are asking farmers to help the Government develop areas which could not be otherwise developed.

Let us get back to the time of the passage of the reclamation law. At that time there were within the continental boundaries of the United States nine and a half million acres under irrigation. We had reached a time when the effort of individual farmers, cooperative societies and associations, and corporations to reclaim arid lands had practically covered all of the projects that could be reclaimed at a reasonable cost; and the question agitated before Congress and argued for several years was this: Is it proper to take the proceeds of the sale of public lands and use them for the purpose of making other lands available for settlement and use? Is it proper to take this fund, of which we have given 127,000,000 acres to homesteaders, of which we have given 77,000,000 acres to the railroads, of which we have given 37,000,000 acres to the States, besides millions in cash receipts, no cent of which was ever paid back—is it proper to take this fund, which is not raised by taxation upon the people of the United States, but which comes from the sale of the public domain, and use it for the purpose of making fruitful and productive acres which otherwise would remain arid and unprofitable and useless until the day when Gabriel blows his trumpet? Remember, we did not contemplate the undertaking of a single project which was of such a character that would invite private enterprise. In other words, we did not contemplate and we have not undertaken projects which were not so difficult and expensive in their character that they could not bear the burden of an interest charge. We undertook this work because these projects could not bear an interest charge, and if there had been any suggestion whatever that we were to charge interest on this investment, we never would have undertaken the work. We undertook the work. Twenty-seven primary projects have been taken up. They have cost more than was anticipated. It has cost more to bring the acres into a condition for cultivation than was anticipated. Markets have not always developed as rapidly as we had hoped. Under these circumstances and conditions we ask what?

We ask, first, that the period within which repayment shall be made shall be extended to 20 years, and, second, that the amount to be paid each year shall be made definite. That is just as important a part of this legislation as the extension of time, because as matters now stand the Secretary of the Interior, within his authority, I believe, has so adjusted these payments as to make them very small at the beginning, enlarging them as time goes on, so that before the expiration of the 10 years they become so large that the entrymen can not meet them. We want to have the payments definite, so that people going on these projects shall know in advance just how much they have to pay and just when they have to pay it. The gentleman from New York says that we do not charge either the capital or the interest on rivers and harbors and other improvements because they are for the benefit of all of the people. So they are, in a way, and yet there are certain people who secure infinitely more benefits from them than the body of the people as a whole, and the country in which these projects are located receives practically no direct benefit at all from the millions of money that we expend for the improvement of rivers and harbors. The gentleman spoke of the Panama Canal, and he is complaining because from the proceeds of the public lands we have not paid for the Panama Canal. As patriotic citizens we are in favor of that great canal, and yet we know that the building of it will be of little direct benefit to the intermountain country. If it affects us at all, the effect is likely to be to tend to keep up our railroad rates rather than to help decrease them, and yet we are in favor of that project and we will pay our part of it for its building and its maintenance. There is scarcely an expenditure of the Government that reaches that central intermountain region which is directly beneficial to its people save the payment of pensions. But these people are not asking any special favors of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government on its own motion, not at the request of these settlers from Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Kentucky, and elsewhere who have come there, but on its own motion, out of the proceeds of the public lands—a fund that has always been held to be a public extension fund, a public improvement fund—out of the proceeds of this fund the Government says, "We will reclaim these mighty projects; we will put mighty structures across these great gorges; we will build great tunnels and great diverting works; and we will carry water to these lands, and we invite you upon them, and we ask that you shall pay every dollar back that we invest in these lands." And the settlers are willing to pay it; they are expecting to pay it; and they are desirous of paying it, and all they ask is that the terms of the payments shall be such that they can comfort-

ably meet them. If these particular arid areas could have been irrigated and stand an interest charge, they would have been irrigated, as the other 12,000,000 acres have been irrigated, by private enterprise and individual effort; but it is because the dams are mighty and the diversion works monumental and the charge enormous that the Government, having this fund, which has always been used for internal improvements and for the development of the country, took the fund and loaned it in order that these lands may be put in the condition in which they may be farmed and reclaimed. Of course, there are not as many of these farmers as there are people in some Eastern States, but there will be some day, let us hope. Of course, they are not all of the population of the United States, but they are honest, God-fearing, self-helpful folks, and all they are asking is that they shall have such time as is necessary within which to make the payments on the acres which, had they not been developed by these works built by the Federal Government, never could have been developed and would have remained arid for all time.

How many millions have we voted for the lower Mississippi Valley this year? Three millions, is it not? And that, I think, totals up \$101,000,000 spent there. I vote for these expenditures because I think them necessary, and yet I know, and everyone else knows, that a large part of that expenditure is for the protection of private property along that mighty stream rather than in the aid of navigation. That is a gift, that is a grant, as many other expenditures of the Government are, without expectation of return of the principal and no suggestion of interest. But here are expenditures which bring into full fruitage great areas that otherwise would have remained arid and unprofitable, as they are in their natural state. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada and Mr. GORDON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to speak against the amendment?

Mr. GORDON. In favor of it; the previous speaker was against it.

Mr. Chairman, I have never heard so much rotten political economy upon the floor of this House on any proposition as has been emitted by the proponents of this bill. [Applause.] Gentlemen stand up here and compare the donations provided for these arid States with the appropriations made for public highways, rivers and harbors, and railroads. There is absolutely no comparison, no analogy between those expenditures. When the Government of the United States first started on this enterprise it committed a monumental blunder, a perfectly idiotic proposition, as the gentleman from Wyoming has just demonstrated. He opens his speech by saying, "I decline to yield" [applause]; that all the lands out there which it was practical to reclaim had been reclaimed by private enterprises. Of course that is true. The lands which were practical to reclaim have been reclaimed by private individuals, and when there were no other arid lands available that any man of common sense would put his money into, then they come back to the Congress, as they always do. [Applause.] Now, they talk about a contract there. If they have any contract, they have not produced it. They have got appropriations of all the proceeds of the sale of public lands in the arid regions out there, and they have taken every dollar of it, and they have got a bond issue, I understand, of \$20,000,000 besides. Now, the Government of the United States never expressly or by implication agreed to maintain these pumps, dams, and other paraphernalia out there to supply these men with water. They gave them the land, and then they appropriated the proceeds of the sales of public lands, and they have used that and they have spent it.

Now they come in here and ask to have the time extended from 10 to 20 years. I see nothing in the argument that the proceeds of the sale of the public domain is not public property. I never heard such a pretense made before until it was made in support of this bill. Of course it is public property and belongs to the Government of the United States, just as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] here demonstrated, and but for this idiotic resolution adopted in 1902 that money would have been used for public purposes and we would not be paying interest on bonds to build the Panama Canal as we now are. Talk about gifts to the railroads. Everybody who knows enough to come in out of the wet knows that the donations to railroads are given upon the theory that they are public highways and we are engaged now in trying to keep down the rates upon the theory that they are a public highway. Is not all the legislation enacted by Congress during the past 27 years based upon the theory that they are public highways? We gave them these enormous bonuses of land and money upon the express theory that they were.

Mr. SHERLEY. And if the gentleman will permit I would suggest to the gentleman, too, that the worst scandal in America

grew out of the gifts to the railroads, and it is a mighty bad precedent to cite.

Mr. GORDON. Of course that is true. We gave great empires of land, enormous donations of money, under the theory of law, and it is only a theory, that they could only charge the public for using the highway a reasonable tax or toll. We created a great court here for the purpose of hearing and determining whether they are charging more than a reasonable tax or toll upon the freight and commerce of the country. But there is no analogy between such gifts as that, unwise as it was, and this. This is a pure donation to private individuals, nothing else, and they come here now and ask you to extend the time 10 years longer without any interest. I see absolutely no justification or excuse for it.

As has been very well pointed out here when you loan the people out in the arid region of Nevada and Colorado and other desert States money out of the Public Treasury without interest, how are you going to refuse to loan to the people of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, who have land that is worth something, money to improve their lands with interest? You can not escape it unless you propose to make a special favored class out of these people who have seen fit to go out there and make their homes upon the desert. Now, the reason for the Government undertaking this, of course, is perfectly apparent; it is because it is an unwise business proposition and there is a desire to saddle it upon the Government, and that is the reason why we who are here now—remember this was 12 years ago and we are not responsible for what occurred 12 years ago or what Mr. Roosevelt did—are asked to do this. This is a piece of rotten, one-sided socialism and ought to be stopped, and the Government ought to put the heel of its condemnation upon it. That is what it ought to do, and it ought to do it first by requiring these people to pay a reasonable rate of interest. Of course you will not get the money back; I do not think you will ever collect either the principal or the interest; but if you impose interest you will do one thing. You will keep a lot of other fools from going out there and trying to make a home on these desert lands. [Applause.] That is one of the good purposes that this amendment might subserve if it should pass. I heard the gentleman from New Mexico, one of the most eloquent men in this House, here last week dilate upon the horrors of the people who undertake to live out in that desert region. He said that they have to go to the towns and work upon the streets in order to make a living for their families.

I do not believe in donating the Government assets to inveigle people to go out there to try to make a living on desert lands. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] says they ask no special favors from the Government. I would like to have him tell me what this is if it is not a special favor, by loaning Government money without interest to invest in a rotten business enterprise that no business man would engage in? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I can not hope in the brief time allotted to me to enter into any extended discussion of this question, but I wish to say that I have been a member of the Committee on Irrigation for several years which has had the present bill under consideration, know its contents, and hope that this amendment will be defeated.

I come from that stock of people who drove ox teams across this continent in 1849 and helped to blaze the way for western development and its present civilization. I was born in the West, and when Members speak upon this floor of the old sagebrush land as worthless land, and of irrigation as a failure, I feel that I should resent the slander on our State in the manner it deserves. A man who would not stand up for his State under those circumstances certainly would not be worthy of a position in this House. [Applause.]

I was glad to hear the position of the great leader of the majority in this House, Mr. UNDERWOOD. He stood before you and opposed this amendment. He put it before you as any statesman should put it, and not in a narrow-minded way. The President of the United States stands for this bill; the Speaker of this House stands behind the western people always, and we all know how that great ex-President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, the father of irrigation projects, stood for western development, and did what he could to develop the Western States.

Why, gentlemen, the State of Ohio, from which the gentleman who just spoke hails, does not compare any more with the State from which I come than a baby's diaper compares with a tablecloth. We can wrap the State of Ohio up in one corner of the great arid lands of Nevada. [Applause.] Nevada awaits to-day, with millions and millions of acres of public lands that only need water to make of them a paradise.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] talked about the development of rivers. Of course, his State never wants its hand in the pork barrel. Philadelphia never wants any money that she does not give back. What about the Mississippi River, the Ohio River, and all your rivers and harbors? Who gets the benefit of them? We at least will pay back the principal. You pay back nothing. Who gets the benefit of your rivers, wharves, and harbors? Why, private individuals and corporations. Talk about private individuals in the West receiving the only benefits of this bill. Who is it that gets the benefit of your rivers, wharves, and harbors if it is not the privately owned steamboats and other corporations? And yet you come here, when these poor, struggling farmers, who are trying to eke out an existence and who are trying to raise produce for all the people in these United States, and say to them, "Why, you have got to pay interest upon the money. We will not lend you a helping hand." If we get the benefit of your rivers, harbors, and wharves, do you not also get the benefit of our farms? Every tree that is grown upon those arid lands benefits the whole country. I tell you it is about time that the people of the Eastern States we have been helping all these long years should wake up and take a broader view of things.

You may want our assistance some time. I am glad to help all meritorious propositions, and I am particularly glad to help the poor old South. I am glad to see the South get a little bit of what is coming to them now, and I will vote for any appropriation that seeks to benefit them in any way. This bill will benefit all the people, and I hope it will pass without this amendment. It would be an outrage to charge those people interest. God knows their lot is a hard one, and this Government should see that they get a square deal—that is all we ask. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has agreed to recognize some members of the committee, and the time against the amendment has been pretty well spoken for. I presume the gentleman is against the amendment?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I am opposed to the amendment; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will then recognize the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, at this time, in order to expedite the consideration and passage of this bill, although I am a member of the committee, I should prefer to waive my time, as I did for that purpose last Wednesday when this matter was before the House. But this is such an important matter to my State and my district that I feel it my duty to say a few words, particularly upon this interest amendment.

Although the amendment offered to the section really relates to an interest payment by the new settlers on these projects, yet this discussion has taken such a wide range that the whole matter of interest upon the project, both for the new and the old settlers, is before the House. And for this reason I desire to make my observations particularly upon an amendment that probably will be offered to the next section, an amendment exacting the payment of interest from the old settlers upon these projects as a consideration for the proposed extension of time.

Mr. Chairman, upon the passage of the reclamation act, as is stated by H. G. Tyson, jr., of Idaho, the settlers and the Government undertook reciprocal parts in the reclamation and the settlement of the arid lands of the West. The Government impliedly in the reclamation act encouraged the settlers to believe, and made implied representations by the very terms of the act, that if the settlers would settle upon and cultivate these lands for which the Government would furnish water these lands could be reclaimed and the payments made within a 10-year period. These implied representations and inducements on the part of the Government were supplemented by actual and direct representations made by the reclamation officials in person upon the projects to prospective settlers and the farmers owning the land. These representations were, no doubt, honestly made. Relying upon these representations, the settlers and farmers went upon these lands, have spent their time and many thousands of dollars on the same. They have performed their part of that reciprocal contract. They should not now be penalized with an interest payment for the Government's mistake.

Upon one project in my State, the Klamath project, the reclamation officials held a meeting attended by 200 farmers, and told them that the lands could be reclaimed at a little greater expense than \$13.65 an acre. They told these farmers that in order to be absolutely sure they would add 20 per cent, making the reclamation price \$16.40 an acre. At the same time private people were there willing to take over this project

and reclaim the same at a price of \$15 an acre. The settlers and the farmers preferred to rely upon the representations made by the reclamation officers. They preferred a contract with the Government to a contract with private individuals, and therefore they listed their lands with the Reclamation Service. Four years after that meeting was held public notice was issued compelling the settlers to pay \$30 an acre to reclaim these lands. Now, is the Government going to take advantage of its own wrong, its own misrepresentations, and exact interest from these farmers who relied upon the Government representation? Does not fair dealing demand, when it is disclosed that 20 years—not 10—is a reasonable period to make payment, that the same be granted without the added burden of interest? Why, Mr. Chairman, if the same state of facts, the same circumstances, were presented in an equity suit brought by these settlers against some private corporation making these representations to them, do you doubt for one moment but that such court of equity would decree a rescission of this contract, which would not only restore to the settlers the money they had expended upon these projects, but would reimburse them for the damages and for their loss of time? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, in the speeches made by several gentlemen this afternoon on this bill there have been two lines of argument. Certain Members have spoken for interest, at variance with a contract made in 1902, and certain Members have spoken for the farmer and the integrity of the contract of 1902. Coming from the State of Indiana we find a lawyer talking about what ought to obtain as regards the welfare of the arid-land farmer. Then we hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who is a farmer, as I understand, but who owns the farm and lets the other fellow do the work, talking about what should be done as regards the interests of the arid-land farmers. And then the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore], a newspaper man, or something of that nature—

Mr. MOORE. A farmer's boy. [Laughter.]

Mr. FALCONER. Well, he was a boy so long ago that he has forgotten all about the vicissitudes from which the farmer suffers—cutting loose some of the bon-ton, artistic-souled sentiment of Philadelphia. And then the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] speaks against the bill and tells us what should be done as regards the farmers. I will say, in passing, that the gentleman from New York, who is close to the administration, ought to spend some time in telling the House why the Democratic administration has not lived up to its pledges and given the farmers of this country a favorable loan system, and not fight the interests of the farmers by opposing this legislation.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], whose speech was very brief, and who covered the subject as thoroughly as if he had talked for an hour, will, I am sure, find his effort fully appreciated by these men in the far West who have been brought into certain unfortunate conditions, partly on account of the insufficiency of the knowledge of the United States Government's employees in presenting the estimated cost of this reclamation proposition.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] refers to these men who are out here in the Northwest country as "fools." Others have referred to them as "poor devils." I want to submit here, these men who meet the obstructions and discouragements of the new country are the most substantial and the most wholesome class of people to be found in the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is plainly understood, and its merits are certainly evident to anyone giving it any consideration. The necessity for this particular legislation is evident from the variety and number of bills introduced by gentlemen from a number of different States.

The wisdom of the Department of the Interior in recommending this bill, covering all the good points of all the bills heretofore presented on the subject, is characteristic of the alertness and ability of the Interior Department, under the able direction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Hon. Franklin K. Lane. Surely the majority side of this House is ready to give serious consideration to the matter, and I believe serious consideration means support.

Unqualifiedly the Secretary has indorsed the bill. He has so expressed himself to many Members.

Under date of June 2, 1914, I received the following letter, which shows the necessity for the passage of the bill before August 1:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 2, 1914.

Hon. J. A. FALCONER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FALCONER: I have your letter of May 26 with respect to the payments to be made by settlers on reclamation projects. This

matter has been receiving the constant attention of the department, and on May 29 I issued the following order:

"No action under order of June 23, 1913, will be taken awaiting action of Congress on extension bill. If said bill is not enacted into law by August 1, an order will be made requiring payment by August 15. If passed, an order will be made by August 15 in conformity with the terms of the new law."

The order of June 23, referred to, reduced by two-thirds the building charge last due on the water-right application of each water user and ordered that there should be no cancellation of entries or water-right applications for delinquency in payments until December 1, 1913.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

After a visit to several of the western reclamation projects Secretary Lane reported:

There is one matter of great moment to these people which should be corrected by law as soon as possible. We mistook the ability of the farmer to pay for his water rights. Ten years was the time given. His optimism and our own was too great. That time should be doubled.

The Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands unanimously voted that the bill as amended should pass, and Secretary Lane urged its passage in a communication addressed to the chairman of the committee.

The Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912 says:

We believe in the conservation and the development for the use of the people of the natural resources of the country. Our forests, our sources of water supply, our arable and our mineral lands, our navigable streams, and all the other material resources with which our country has been so lavishly endowed constitute the foundation of our national wealth.

The public domain should be administered and disposed of with due regard to the general welfare.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the general welfare in connection with our arable lands is being served by the purposes of this bill. Every precaution has been taken to exclude the speculator, the land grabber, and it is strictly true, sir, that the people benefited by the extension of the payment provision are honest, industrious farmers.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, at the opposition of gentlemen on the minority side of the House.

The Republican platform of 1912 has a plank bearing directly on this matter:

We favor such fair and reasonable rules and regulations as will not discourage or interfere with actual bona fide home seekers, prospectors, and miners in the acquisition of public lands under existing laws.

We favor the continuance of the policy of the Government with regard to the reclamation of arid lands; and for the encouragement of the speedy settlement and improvement of such lands we favor an amendment to the law that will reasonably extend the time within which the cost of any reclamation project may be repaid by the landowners under it.

Gentlemen from Illinois suggest that there is much land in the rain-belt regions where settlers might locate, stating further that there is much land in Illinois where, if the Government would furnish noninterest-bearing loans, farmers would buy and settle on land.

I want to say in that connection, Mr. Chairman, that there is much land in my State—developed lands, if you please—similar, as regards development, to Illinois farms where many men now asking for extensions would gladly buy developed farms if the Government would loan low-interest money. But the Government is not doing that kind of business. The intention of the Government should be and is to develop good land, even at extra cost, on a plan by which the Government would be reimbursed.

WHAT IS THE MATTER?

What is the matter with this country, Mr. Chairman? We have heard much discussion on the floor of the House the past few months, suggesting that something was awry. The high cost of living is said to continue; social and industrial conditions are unsettled.

The Republicans call down the condemnation of the political gods on the Underwood tariff bill.

The Democrats insist that present and past unfavorable conditions are due to the result of the Republican Party policies of years past, resulting in making a few men very rich and many men very poor, and gentlemen here on the floor of the House teeter, totter, and, figuratively speaking, chase each other around the block with much gusto and a great noise, each trying to make the people of the country believe that the "other fellow" is to blame for the present apparent standstill.

Do they tell us where the trouble lies?

I will tell you, sir, what is the matter with this country: There are not men in sufficient numbers on farms producing from the soil. It would pay the United States Government to embark on a line of economic operation that would remove from the thickly settled centers a percentage of the population and place them with Government aid on the lands of the country.

There are too many drones—nonproducers—in the country; too many doing the "middleman" act—making money off of

the other fellow, the other fellow who produces. This, sir, answers the question: What is the matter?

And here we are to-day, 435 Congressmen—the producer might suggest too many—considering the advisability of making it possible for real men, men who produce from the soil, to meet the demands that certain unfavorable conditions have placed upon them.

These men with families have denied themselves and have gone through stringent times, real—not "statesmen-talk"—hard times to the end that they might finish the work of development; converting the waste desert of arid lands, once inhabited by sagebrush and sand lizards, into habitable homesteads and eventually reach a standard of reclamation and a state of cultivation that excels in richness of production and attendant comforts of life.

And yet we hesitate, we try to make ourselves wonder whether the Government should assist actual farmers who are now on the lands engaged in earnest endeavor to honorably carry out their end of a contract.

We, the Congress, sir, should not hesitate to extend the conditions of the original contract on the same lines, too, since the costs have been so much greater than originally estimated by the Government engineers in charge. And we should make new contracts and amend our laws to favor farm settlement.

Mr. Chairman, the Government should do all this bill suggests; the responsibility is upon this Congress. We are a grand country, with immense natural resources, good men, and brave women; but in our endeavor to "beat the world" in science and in trade we have neglected a more important matter—farm development and production. We should certainly treat our people as well as Australia does her people, but as a matter of fact we do not. Certain States of Australia not only provide money for development of farm lands, but furnish public overseers, experts in agricultural matters, to oversee and advise the man who is trying to work out new methods attendant upon the new country conditions, incidentally shielding the settler from the machinations of the land shark. Then the Government furnishes 75 per cent of the money necessary to build a house and clears, grades, and seeds one-fourth of his land.

The farm-loan branch of their State or Government money system accrues to the benefit of the man who borrows. Workmen who make their weekly or monthly deposits of savings get usually 3 per cent, and the banks loan to farmers at a rate of 4½ per cent, or at 6 per cent if it is desired, and 1½ per cent goes into a sinking fund, so that at the end of 31 years the interest and principal are entirely paid.

The thing needed most in this country is to get the man who loans and the man who borrows together with the least possible administration charges, and the way to do it is through a Government medium. There are many Congressmen here who probably would hesitate in adopting the suggestion that we employ a Government system of farm finance. It appears to be a somewhat radical change, but surely the bill under consideration can not be objected to on any substantial grounds, for this bill simply carries out the principle of the original reclamation bill of 1902.

Mr. Chairman, there are many people in my State interested in this measure. I am daily in receipt of communications urging its passage, and I sincerely hope it may pass to-day, conforming in noninterest-bearing features with the original contract of 1902 and with section 16 restored to the bill as it was reported to the Senate. [Applause.]

[Mr. HENSLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that gentlemen opposed to this amendment have consumed 33 minutes of the hour allotted for discussion of this amendment, and the gentlemen for it have consumed 5 minutes. The understanding was that the time was to be as equally divided as possible.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this amendment, although I do not know that if I were writing it into a law I would write it in just the way it is now presented. If the amendment is agreed to, of course it will go back to the Senate and probably into conference.

I think myself that the time for the payment of the principal of the construction charge ought to be extended even beyond 20 years, because the construction charge on these reclamation projects amounts to what would in ordinary cases be the purchase price of the land. And while a farmer in Illinois buys a piece of land even for \$150 an acre and gives a mortgage for a considerable portion of the purchase price, due in five years, he knows that at the end of that time he can secure an extension of that mortgage or can secure another mortgage with which to pay off the first mortgage.

In this case, in the reclamation project, the construction charge must be paid to the Government at the time stated—paid theoretically, at least. It has not been lived up to, so far, but we may consider that that is the case. So that the man who pays for his farm on a reclamation project, under the form of paying the construction charge, ought to have a sufficient time in which to realize the total cost. Usually that could not be done in 10 years, and, with the payment of interest, probably could not be done often in 20 years. It could easily be done in 30 or 40 years, with the payment of interest. Now, under the existing law, they are required to pay the entire construction charge in 10 years, in the main without interest. Probably that was a mistake, and put an undue burden where the construction charge amounted to \$40, \$50, \$60, \$70, \$80, \$90, or \$100 an acre; although in Illinois, where I was raised, farms sell at from \$150 to \$250 an acre, for farm purposes, and no one pretends that they can raise as much per acre on that land as it is claimed they can raise per acre on the irrigated land.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. For my own information I want to ascertain just what funds these people who pay this money are now paying interest on and what they are not paying interest on.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, they will have to pay interest, as a part of the construction charge, on any portion of the \$20,000,000 raised from the sale of bonds authorized a few years ago. But they do not pay interest on anything else.

Mr. GARNER. This proposition is that they shall pay interest, not only on the \$20,000,000, but on all the money out of the public lands that has gone into the reclamation fund.

Mr. MANN. The proposition now pending before the House does not affect anyone now on the projects. It only affects those who go on hereafter.

Now, I am inclined to think that where we entered into a contract with those now on these projects, it would not be advisable to require them to pay interest up to the time practically that their loan is extended, but if they ask for an extension, as they do in this bill, I can see no reason why they should not pay interest on the payments which are deferred, without any injustice to them. After all, this is a fundamental proposition of government: Has the Government the moral right to engage in an enterprise as a business enterprise which can not afford to pay interest for the use of the money? The Government of the United States could use this \$80,000,000, which has been expended on reclamation projects, in the purchase of land in Virginia, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, New England, or New York, and give that land to farmers who would take it, furnishing enough money to place the man on the farm, and he would be glad to pay interest for the use of the money; and if that had been done, it would have produced more sustenance than will be produced by the same amount of expenditure on the irrigation projects. You could have bought plenty of land in those States for \$10 an acre, much of it cheaper than that, land which many people would be glad to go upon and cultivate and raise crops. But can the Government as a fundamental proposition afford to do this where the results do not warrant any interest payment? Because that is the test of the value of money. Do the irrigation projects pay if the farmers on them can not make money enough to pay a low rate of interest for the money which has gone into the making of the place?

I do not believe in grinding any of these people. I believe we ought to encourage them. I have no doubt that they would be able to pay interest. If I had my way about it, I think I would make a principal payment for a number of years of not to exceed 1 or 2 per cent, but would require the payment of interest. As a man gets his farm under cultivation and secures a ready and perhaps near market for the products of his farm, he can afford to pay a higher proportion of the principal, while he is at the same time having the amount of his interest reduced.

But no man in this House can go to the country and to his constituents and defend a proposition for the Government to loan money for the farmers in Montana, in Wyoming, in Washington, in Idaho, in Colorado, in Nevada, New Mexico, and Arizona, and California, and refuse to give the credit of the Government to farmers in New England and New York, who are just as anxious to get the land and make money out of the soil as are the farmers elsewhere. [Applause.] If you loan the money in one instance without interest, how can you defend the refusal to advance the credit of the Government in the other case without interest?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The pressing problem in my immediate section is to get the water off the land rather than

to get it on. Would there be any difference in principle in loaning the money without interest to the farmers of the States the gentleman has mentioned and to the landowners in my immediate section to drain the land?

Mr. MANN. I think not. I lived on the prairies of Illinois, when in the spring of the year I could make a little raft and pole it over every portion of the township except a few high spots; raised a few feet above the level of the rest of the land, where the houses were. And between the house in which I lived and the barn where our horses and cattle were kept was a river, in the spring of the year, rods wide, over which we had to build a bridge. That country needed drainage; the land was of little value. Now it is tile drained and thoroughly ditched by the expenditure of money raised by these people themselves. If they could have gotten the credit of the Government to borrow money at 3 per cent they would have been well off. They paid a much higher rate than 3 per cent, and they did not have the length of time now proposed in which to pay back the principal; and yet the expenditure of money which they made for draining has well paid them. They raise great crops now, as these people on the reclamation projects will raise.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does not the gentleman see a distinction between lands in private ownership and lands the Government owned where irrigation projects were installed?

Mr. MANN. No; I do not.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a further question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does the gentleman from Illinois imagine that one of these men in the Salt River Valley could have been induced by a representative of the Government to enter on that project if he had known that instead of costing \$15 an acre the project would cost \$60 an acre?

Mr. MANN. I met a gentleman the other day who had passed quite a time at Phoenix. He told me that they were asking \$150 and \$200 an acre on these reclamation projects now, subject to the construction charge to be paid the Government, and they want an extension of time for the payment of the construction charge without interest. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 13 minutes. The Chair stated that the other side had consumed 33 minutes. That was a mistake; it should have been 28 minutes. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, underneath the proposition of those who say the settlers should not pay interest lie two premises that in my judgment are unsound. First, that the public domain belongs peculiarly to the section in which it happens to be, instead of belonging to all the people of America; second, that because it is public domain it is proper to do with it what you would not do if it was private land.

Now, there is a clear distinction between the Government giving land to a settler ready for cultivation and the Government giving land to a settler with an undertaking to expend money on the land in order to make it useful for the settler.

The difference is fundamental. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] clearly pointed out, when you go into the improvement of land you put the Government into a business that should at least economically justify itself. The Government, under some conditions, might well give away the land of the public domain for settlement and stop there. Men might justify it on the basis of being the means of creating homesteads. But when the Government goes a step further, and not only undertakes to give the land but undertakes to enter into a business project to make the land worth settling, then you are faced with an economical proposition, and in order to justify that undertaking you must show that the thing you propose to do is worth doing economically. If it is not able to bear an interest charge, it is manifestly not worth doing, and you are driven back every time to the proposition presented by the gentleman from Illinois that if you are going to give the land to these people and make it, through a business enterprise, suitable for them without charging them any interest on the investment, the Government must be willing to do the same thing for all the country everywhere, and yet that means socialism beyond the dream of anybody in America.

If you will search the speeches of every one of the gentlemen from the public-land States, you will find that back of them lies the opinion that, somehow or other, this land is their State's peculiar property and that it is the duty of the National Government to treat it for their especial benefit in a way different from that it would employ as to land elsewhere. Why, analogies have been made here that are comical. Men have per-

mitted their eloquence to run away with their judgment. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], usually conservative in his utterances, made comparisons that would not stand analysis for half a minute. The difference between a river and harbor improvement, the difference between aids to navigation, such as lighthouses, the difference between a Government undertaking such as these and those in connection with irrigation projects is this, that the thing improved does not go into private ownership for the benefit of the private individual, to be used as a profit for the individual. There is no more comparison between the two than there is between night and day, and nobody would know it better than the gentleman from Alabama if he thought for just one moment.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. This money, the gentleman says, does not go for private profit. Does the gentleman realize that the money there on these plants, not on the farms, but on these big plants, goes into a public enterprise for a vast number of people?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not; because it is not a public enterprise by any stretch of the imagination. It is the property of the settlers who take up the land under the reclamation project, who pay for the cost of maintaining it, and who get the profit from the increased fertility of the land thereby made tillable.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman know that many of these projects are undertaken and constructed, to quite an extent, before there are any settlers upon them?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes; and that is just it. Here is a business enterprise undertaken for certain private parties at the time unknown, but nevertheless for private parties, who shall come in on the land after the project has been completed and reap the benefits in the fertility of the soil brought about by virtue of the project when it has been completed. It is useless, from my point of view, to argue with a man who can not see the distinction between an improvement that is usable by the whole country and an improvement which is for the benefit of private individuals, no matter how numerous.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman know that many of these settlers were induced to go there under what would have been misrepresentation if it had been a matter suggested by a private individual or a corporation?

Mr. SHERLEY. They may have been so induced; and one of the vices of the present bill is that now, in the light of your 10 years of failure, you are undertaking to induce more men to go there at Government expense. [Applause.] That is the trouble with your whole bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Do I understand the gentleman to contend that the law should be repealed?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think before you went on with a lot of your projects you ought to consider whether they are really worth going on with. You are very much in the situation of a man who has put a sum of money into an unprofitable business. He is a stockholder, let us say, in a corporation that has not made good. There is a call for subscription on the stock. He has to put up more money on that which is sunk.

If he is a wise man, the question that he asks himself is this: Is there enough merit anywhere in the project to warrant the expending of additional money over that which heretofore has given no sufficient return? I question very much whether under that test some of your reclamation systems would not absolutely fall to the ground. But instead of doing that you propose not only to put more money into every project that you have started, but to put money into new ones, and to induce people to go out there under conditions that, according to the gentleman's statement, are so difficult as to make it our duty to warn rather than to induce men to go there.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman tell us what he would do with this condition?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will tell you what I would do. I would make these projects bear the practical test that things bear in the commercial life of a people. The best test of a thing is whether it can stand on its own feet, and if it can not stand with an interest charge at a Government rate, infinitely lower than can be obtained from any private source, then it is of

such doubtful caliber that I, for one, am not willing to go into the Treasury to back it up. [Applause.]

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question.

Mr. FALCONER. The money is expended, the ditches are dug, and what we want to do is to get men to go in and file on the land, to come in under the ditches, and that is the only way to pay it off.

Mr. SHERLEY. That may or may not be so; you may be able to pay it off that way, but what you are doing under the terms of this bill is to provide for entering upon new projects. The terms of your bill so provide.

Mr. DECKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DECKER. I am confused, and I would like to know if the gentleman thinks there is need of stopping to see whether this thing will be economically wise?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, well; I can answer the gentleman by saying that the proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. If you provide economical conditions, then if it pays it will be economically sound; but if it will not pay, if it will not bear such conditions, it would not be economically wise.

Mr. DECKER. How is it that the land is worth \$150 an acre, or that much is asked, if it is not economically sound?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is one of the conflicts that come in the testimony here. One gentleman stands up and depicts the horrors of the settler who has to come to town and work on the streets in order to keep his family from starving, while another gentleman states that under one of these schemes the land is worth from \$150 to \$200 an acre.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question.

Mr. DAVIS. I judge from the gentleman's statement and argument he thinks the Reclamation Service has been a failure. Such being the case, what would the gentleman suggest now would be the remedy for those already in process of construction?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have answered that question. I would suggest as to the future you put each project upon a business basis—

Mr. DAVIS. True.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then if it does not stand, it is proof that we ought not to expend the Government money on it.

Mr. DAVIS. What are you going to do with the present projects now authorized?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would grant an extension of time and let those men pay some interest, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks for one minute additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman in candor I believe the position of you men from the arid States would be infinitely stronger if you had come in here with a bill dealing with the actual settlers who are out there now upon the reclamation projects. I might have been willing to strain a point on the theory that those men have gone there under misapprehension, just as we take care of other unfortunates over the land; but when you come here with a scheme to swallow up all the revenues from all the public lands left in those States in the perpetuation of a scheme that is a self-confessed failure, then I for one am not willing to accept it.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman thinks we had better pocket present losses on what we have now?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I suspect there will be some evidence in that direction in the near future.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted to me it would be impossible for me to present the reasons which clearly to my mind justify this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the danger to the country that would follow from the Government engaging in a business which is purely of a private character, and the charge is made that this bill is class legislation. The purpose of this bill, as I view it, is to take the Government out of the reclamation business, and not to put the Government into that business. We can pass legislation here that will impose further penalties upon the settlers on these projects, that will give them an additional burden of expense in the shape of an interest charge; but we will then be forced to adopt the proposition made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to extend the annual payments by a number of years, which, to my mind, will produce a continuation of present difficulties and impose further hardships on the deserving settlers. The people living on these projects are among our most worthy citizens, and have given the

best that is in them to the development of these reclamation undertakings. The results that have followed their labor and self-sacrifice fully justify the wisdom of the reclamation act of 1902. The Government could well afford to appropriate without reservation the sums already expended on reclamation projects and those required to bring them to completion. The return to the country in productive energy would be ample compensation for this expenditure, and the benefits derived thereby would not be local but general in character. Merely to show what has taken place in one section of Colorado where one of the reclamation projects has been developed, I append a statement showing the growth of population and increase of value of farm property in two Colorado counties—Delta and Montrose. The counties named contain the land reclaimed through the construction of the Gunnison Tunnel. These figures are taken from the last census reports:

Growth of population.

County.	1910	1900	Increase.
Delta.....	13,688	5,487	Per cent. 149.5
Montrose.....	10,291	4,535	126.9

Increase in value of farm property.

County.	1910	1900	Increase.
Delta.....	\$21,024,102	\$4,275,790	Per cent. 391.7
Montrose.....	13,858,209	2,897,504	378.3

The heroism and industry of the people who undertook the reclamation of the arid regions of the West entitle them to recognition by Congress. I am surprised that Representatives from the East and from the South, sections which have been the recipients of governmental favor for the last quarter of a century and even longer, should come into this House to-day and challenge the right of Congress to legislate in behalf of these deserving people. Why, Mr. Chairman, the millions of dollars that have been spent in the development of these projects have largely gone into the trade centers of the East. To-day from the western country are coming the products of the farmers and of the settlers upon reclamation projects to supply the railroads, largely owned in the East, and the investors of the East with dividends and profits upon their investment. As population increases in the West there is an enlarged demand for manufactured goods from the trade centers of the East. No one section of this country can be benefited without enriching other sections. I am surprised that when these hardy and worthy men come here and ask for consideration and for that relief to which they are entitled, they should be opposed by Representatives from the great centers who have received the benefit of their toil and the reward of their industry. Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, that we must provide a plan that will take the Government out of the reclamation business. Twelve years ago the Government was put into the reclamation business, and it was a business that was not understood in all of its ramifications and details. There were many problems that arose after the inauguration of the projects that required great engineering skill, that required amplification of the projects, that required numerous departures from the plans proposed, and imposed a great burden of expense upon those who have settled upon or purchased the land so reclaimed. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is absolutely wrong, in my judgment, to impose the burden of all the mistakes and of all of the errors of the Reclamation Service, of this enlargement of projects, of these failures, so called, upon the very people who are trying by their self-denial and by the toil of their hands to reclaim these arid wastes and add to the productive energies and development of the country.

Mr. Chairman, these people are not asking for charity. They are not coming before Congress pleading for special benefits. They are asking that Congress will simply allow them to work out their destiny under terms and conditions not of their own choosing, but upon liberal terms and conditions imposed upon them by the Government of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the pending measure has brought prominently to the attention of the House the divergent views which exist as to the details of the future policy that should be followed in carrying forward the great work of reclaiming our arid lands. It will be noted with su-

preme satisfaction that but little criticism is given to the principle itself which underlies the reclamation of arid lands as undertaken under the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902, commonly known as the reclamation law. The country has become fully converted to the wisdom and farsighted statesmanship which inaugurated the reclamation policy. This policy is now everywhere regarded as fundamentally sound and a fit companion piece of legislation with the homestead law, and in the years to come, like the homestead law, the beneficent results that will flow from this act in ever-increasing volume will constitute an imperishable monument to the wisdom of its founders.

The prime purpose and object of the reclamation act is to devote the proceeds arising from the sale and disposal of public lands toward the making of other unproductive desert lands habitable and suitable for homes for the people. It is now generally conceded that the thought and basic principle of the reclamation policy is precisely similar to that which inspired the homestead law, and, those voicing their opposition to this measure to-day, had they been members of a former Congress, would have as vigorously condemned the policy of giving public domain away for free homes for the people under our homestead law.

Both of these great measures must be considered on the broad grounds of the building up and developing of a great Nation. It is a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy to restrict our vision only to the dollar-and-cents aspect in the larger questions involving our permanent national welfare. We are building for all time. We are extending the opportunity for agricultural pursuits and furnishing a vent for the evils of the congestion that unfortunately in increasing degree menaces our large cities. It is a truism that "man is disposed to do the least where nature does the most," and in those portions of the earth where large human efforts are demanded in order to triumph over the obstacles of nature will be found the most virile, progressive, intelligent, God-fearing people. As a Nation we pride ourselves in doing big things. We have spanned the continent with great iron highways. We freely devote our means and efforts for the improvement of harbors and waterways. We have just completed the world's greatest engineering achievement, the construction of the Panama Canal. We are actively engaged in conserving our water resources in the arid regions, and transforming the waste places into fields and happy homes wherein "thanksgiving and the voice of melody" supplant the awful stillness and desolation of the desert.

Regardless of the immense outlay in these undertakings, every patriotic citizen rejoices in every enterprise permanently contributed to our national welfare and prosperity. We ought not to allow a sectional feeling to possess us in the consideration of larger national policies. I have no envy for those sections in which vast sums are expended for rivers and harbors and other national purposes, and likewise gratefully appreciate the same generous and patriotic purpose evinced by the Representatives of the more humid regions toward the reclamation policy. The chief concern should be that a wise and economical expenditure of such appropriations be made for the permanent public welfare.

Now, what is the proposition confronting the Government in respect to the reclamation of our arid lands? The Government has vast areas of public domain in the so-called arid States which on account of the insufficiency of the rainfall remain unoccupied and desolate. But by conserving the water resources available and applying water on these lands they become susceptible of cultivation and suitable for homes. Through what is being accomplished it may be verily said: "The waste places are made glad and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as a rose, for in the wilderness shall waters break out and streams in the desert." The parched ground shall exult in fertility and be clad in plenty.

The hardy pioneer has accomplished a great deal. Through his sacrifice and determination the dull gray expanse of sagebrush plains has been transmuted in a beautiful mosaic of green meadow, golden grain, and ripening orchards. He has demonstrated the efficacy of irrigation and revealed the perennial fertility of the desert when combined with magic element. To the devout and earnest pioneers of Utah all honor is due for what they have done in the interest of western development. They were the first in the Rocky Mountain region to illustrate and proclaim the marvelous fertility of the parched and forbidding sagebrush lands when reclaimed by irrigation. From our earliest settlement irrigation has been applied successfully by the people of Utah in the cultivation of fields, gardens, and orchards. Our mountain streams were early di-

verted to this use by the unremitting industry and enterprise of those hardy pioneers.

The future development of irrigation in Utah must depend, therefore, upon the conservation of the flow waters. The Reclamation Service has undertaken but one irrigation scheme in Utah—the Strawberry project—which is designed to furnish water for 50,000 to 60,000 acres of land in one of the richest and most populous sections of the State. The project, though not a large one, is most interesting and important in the extent of its benefits. By means of a tunnel through the rim of the Great Basin water which now flows to the Pacific Ocean is conducted into the Salt Lake Valley, thereby permanently increasing the water resources of the Great Basin. Under this project the water, after discharging its duty of irrigation on the uplands, will eventually find its way to the Utah Lake, where by pumping it can be made available to irrigate lands in an adjoining county, thus performing a double duty.

But while the reclamation project in Utah is not a large one compared with other feasible projects of greater extent and benefit that could have been undertaken in the State, and which still await future development, it is only just to say that no project of its size and kind contains superior strategic conditions to insure its success both as a sound and sure investment and as an enterprise conferring lasting benefit upon its water users. The activities of the Reclamation Service in constructing irrigation works in and of itself, however, does not measure the extent of such development in the arid States. During the past decade a tremendous impetus has been imparted to private initiative and enterprise, and many private irrigation projects have been inaugurated in the arid States. Without in the least decrying the work of the Reclamation Service, I want to point to what has been accomplished in my own State with its reservoir fund. This fund arises from a grant of 500,000 acres of land for reservoir purposes contained in the enabling act of 1894. The proceeds from the disposal of these lands constitute a reservoir fund from which loans have been made to encourage private irrigation enterprises. The State of Utah also has constructed two large reservoirs with the requisite canals to irrigate large tracts of State land. From the splendid accomplishment in irrigation under our State administration I can say that undoubtedly liberal grants of land for reclamation purposes to the several arid States would prove an effective supplement to the general Federal reclamation policy.

The States thereby could promote the building of smaller projects capable of private or State development, and the Reclamation Service could find an ample field in constructing feasible irrigation systems beyond the capacity of private capital. When the Government entered upon the construction of irriga-

tion works under the reclamation act the Reclamation Service was obliged to break new ground and blaze out new paths of experience. It is too much to say that mistakes were not made in some instances in the beginning, but in the light of experience and in the development and growth of the work a more competent and efficient organization has been effected so that serious mistakes have been reduced to a minimum. The annual report of the Reclamation Service is a full and comprehensive account of the magnitude of the constructive work carried on under it. From this report the following tables shed considerable light on its past and present operations.

From the following statements it will be seen that about \$86,000,000 has already been expended on the various irrigation projects now in the process of completion, reclaiming an area of about 3,000,000 acres. New lands are being opened to settlement as fast as settlers can be found willing to settle upon them. The terms and conditions of payment for the construction charges under the reclamation projects were necessarily fixed without any accurate knowledge of what the cost would be per acre under the various projects or of the ability of the entryman and landowner to comply with the same. Those who are now seeking new homes are willing to give the only wealth they have—their brawn and brain—to the problem of reclaiming these lands, but the money to meet the construction charges must be wrested from the soil by the industry and skill of the settler. Under the terms and conditions of the existing law the settler hesitates to assume the obligations imposed in entering these lands, and many of those who have made entry find themselves unable to meet these obligations. The Secretary of the Interior has investigated conditions, and earnestly given his sanction to granting proper relief. This demand has met with generous consideration by Congress, and there appears a general desire to lighten the burdens resting upon the settlers. The Representatives from the arid States whose constituents are chiefly interested have approved the relief afforded in the present bill.

The States in which the irrigation work is being carried on are most vitally interested in this bill. The reclamation policy is vital to their future growth and development, and they are by far the most directly concerned in securing wise legislation to effectuate its extension and development.

The reclamation fund is a revolving fund, and the more speedily construction charges can be returned the more rapidly can the expansion of irrigation go forward. With this supreme object before them, the Representatives from these States present this bill, believing that its enactment will be a measure of justice and relief to the brave and stout-hearted men who have entered these lands, and will encourage others to engage in the

Statement showing, by projects, the estimated area of public and private irrigable lands, the average size of farm unit, the approximate number of homestead and private purchases of water rights, the price per acre for which water has been sold, and the date when payments began to be made.

State.	Project.	Estimated area of irrigable lands under project (acres).			Average farm unit (acres).	Approximate number of homestead and private purchases of water rights.			Price per acre for which water has been sold.		Date when payments began to be made.
		Public.	Private.	Total.		Public.	Private.	Total.	Building charges.	O. and M.	
Arizona	Salt River	20,074	198,526	218,600	40-42						Rental.
Arizona-California	Yuma	74,000	57,000	131,000	40	171	1	172	\$55, \$60	\$1.00	Jan. 12, 1910
California	Orland	4	19,995	20,000	(1)						Rental.
Colorado	Grand Valley	30,070	22,930	53,000	25-55						Do.
Do.	Uncompahgre	34,000	106,000	140,000	40-80						Do.
Idaho	Boise	67,711	139,289	207,000	40-90						Do.
Do.	Minidoka	96,725	22,000	118,725	40-80	1,115	110	1,225	\$22, \$30, \$40	.75	May 9, 1907
Kansas	Garden City		10,677	10,677	(1)				\$37.50		Mar. 6, 1908
Montana	Huntley	29,213	3,192	32,405	40-52	542	9	551	\$30, \$50	1.00	May 21, 1907
Do.	Milk River	72,000	147,557	219,557	80-92						Rental.
Do.	Sun River	74,974	31,372	106,346	40-80-62	187	11	198	\$30, \$36	1.00	Mar. 26, 1908
Montana-North Dakota	Lower Yellowstone	17,913	42,203	60,116	80-56	103	180	283	\$42.50, \$45	1.50	Dec. 21, 1908
Nebraska-Wyoming	North Platte	83,358	45,912	129,270	40-80-65	820	130	950	\$45, \$55	1.10	July 29, 1907
Nevada	Truckee-Carson	140,451	65,549	206,000	40-80	262	257	519	\$22, \$30	.75	May 6, 1907
New Mexico	Carlsbad		20,277	20,277	(1)			516	\$31, \$45	1.75	Dec. 17, 1907
Do.	Hondo	240	9,760	10,000	(1)						Rental.
New Mexico-Texas	Rio Grande	13,039	141,961	155,000	(2)						Do.
North Dakota	North Dakota pumping	882	11,357	12,239	34-4	9	127	136	\$38	1.00-1.50	Apr. 8, 1908
Oregon	Umatilla	22,336	33,164	55,500	40	125	317	442	\$60, \$70	1.30	Dec. 27, 1907
Oregon-California	Klamath	32,000	38,700	70,700	58	2	428	430	\$30, \$30	.75	Nov. 18, 1908
South Dakota	Bellefourche	44,631	55,369	100,000	40-80-33	321	359	680	\$30, \$35, \$40	.60	June 21, 1907
Utah	Strawberry Valley		60,000	60,000	(1)						Rental.
Washington	Okanogan	1,324	8,837	10,071	40	46	366	412	\$65, \$110	2.25	Nov. 12, 1908
Do.	Yakima										
	Sunnyside	2,565	100,259	102,824	20-32-45	57	3,283	3,350	\$10, \$31, \$52	1.80-.95	Nov. 18, 1908
	Tieton	2,175	32,362	34,537	31	58	996	1,054	\$93	1.50	Nov. 7, 1910
Wyoming	Shoshone	155,469	8,653	164,122	40-80-75	395	7	402	\$45, \$47, \$50, \$52	1.00	Nov. 25, 1907
Total		1,015,064	1,432,902	2,447,966		4,213	7,107	11,320			

¹ Private land.

² Refunded.

³ Not established.

⁴ Average size.

Statement showing acreage to which water can be supplied, acreage which is being irrigated, and public land unentered on Apr. 30, 1914.

State.	Projects.	Acreage for which service can supply water, 1914.	Acreage estimated to be irrigated, 1914.	Public land unentered Apr. 30, 1914.
				<i>Acres.</i>
Arizona.....	Salt River.....	203,431	190,000	
Arizona-California.....	Colorado River.....			
Do.....	Yuma.....	161,575	232,000	60
California.....	Orland.....	14,300	9,000	
Colorado.....	Grand Valley.....			
Do.....	Uncompahgre.....	253,000	26,000	
Idaho.....	Boise.....	207,000	100,000	
Do.....	Minidoka.....	118,000	85,000	859
Kansas.....	Garden City.....			
Montana.....	Huntley.....	30,649	18,000	1,595
Do.....	Milk River.....	15,000	4,500	
Do.....	Sun River.....	16,346	12,000	2,845
Montana-North Dakota.....	Lower Yellowstone.....	36,578	15,000	847
Nebraska-Wyoming.....	North Platte.....	85,828	70,000	4,287
Nevada.....	Truckee-Carson.....	65,000	48,000	265
New Mexico.....	Carlsbad.....	20,267	20,267	
Do.....	Hondo.....	1,200	1,200	
New Mexico-Texas.....	Rio Grande.....	35,000	85,000	
Do.....	Rio Grande Dam appropriation.....			
North Dakota.....	Missouri River pumping.....	12,239	6,000	580
Oklahoma.....	Cimarron.....			
Oregon.....	Central Oregon.....			
Do.....	Umatilla.....	16,750	6,000	116
Oregon-California.....	Klamath.....	35,500	20,000	23
South Dakota.....	Bellefourche.....	68,870	50,000	3,843
Utah.....	Strawberry Valley.....			
Washington.....	Okanogan.....	9,000	8,000	
Do.....	Yakima.....			
Do.....	Sunnyside.....	81,000	68,000	
Do.....	Tieton.....	34,000	20,000	
Wyoming.....	Shoshone.....	41,171	23,000	13,403
Total.....		1,261,704	886,987	28,723

¹ 149,000 water-rental basis; 12,575 public notice.

² 26,500 water-rental basis; 8,500 public notice.

³ Gunnison water will also be furnished to canals in private ownership for 6,000 acres.

⁴ 27,000 public notice; 3,000 water-rental basis.

⁵ 27,000 public notice; 8,500 water-rental basis.

Acreage is 35,000 to Oct. 1; after that, 55,000 acres.

Statement of receipts and expenditures, by States, to Apr. 30, 1914.

State.	Receipts.		Expenditures.
	Bond loan (36 Stat., 835).	Sale of public lands.	
Arizona.....	\$1,455,000	\$1,140,660.74	\$15,594,211.31
California.....	890,000	5,358,943.03	2,683,542.59
Colorado.....	2,500,000	6,680,991.93	6,337,577.56
Idaho.....	2,000,000	5,039,708.90	14,081,170.51
Kansas.....		963,080.07	376,471.20
Montana.....	1,000,000	8,588,290.73	7,334,430.39
Nebraska.....	1,400,000	1,664,013.83	4,397,553.83

Statement of receipts and expenditures, by States, to Apr. 30, 1914—Con.

State.	Receipts.		Expenditures.
	Bond loan (36 Stat., 835).	Sale of public lands.	
Nevada.....	\$1,193,000	\$541,596.96	\$5,588,272.03
New Mexico.....	2,700,000	3,939,790.95	3,831,423.80
North Dakota.....		11,921,898.43	1,947,467.20
Oklahoma.....		5,783,557.84	72,512.10
Oregon.....	775,000	10,413,928.22	3,596,791.08
South Dakota.....		6,823,778.69	3,219,007.83
Texas.....	1,800,000		1,017,928.90
Utah.....	2,272,000	1,890,479.34	2,380,949.61
Washington.....	1,915,000	6,433,289.73	7,590,583.36
Wyoming.....	600,000	4,320,900.45	6,014,027.90
Preliminary investigations.....			80,488.73
General accounts.....			259,655.99
Total.....	20,000,000	81,504,919.82	86,374,066.01

Statement showing total estimated building cost of all primary projects. [Prepared Apr. 2, 1914.]

State.	Project.	Estimated gross building cost to completion.
Arizona.....	Salt River.....	\$11,862,972.46
Arizona-California.....	Yuma.....	9,899,485.95
California.....	Orland.....	936,000.00
Colorado.....	Grand Valley.....	4,535,020.00
Do.....	Uncompahgre.....	9,192,396.83
Idaho.....	Boise.....	14,434,653.47
Do.....	Minidoka.....	4,955,992.23
Kansas.....	Garden City.....	391,082.51
Montana.....	Huntley.....	1,447,050.25
Do.....	Milk River (includes St. Mary storage).....	7,746,897.05
Do.....	Sun River.....	8,387,695.00
Montana-North Dakota.....	Lower Yellowstone.....	2,838,626.32
Nebraska-Wyoming.....	North Platte.....	12,828,014.66
Nevada.....	Truckee-Carson.....	8,449,853.11
New Mexico.....	Carlsbad.....	1,040,253.05
Do.....	Hondo.....	1,439,351.10
New Mexico-Texas.....	Rio Grande (includes Elephant Butte storage).....	9,771,100.00
North Dakota.....	North Dakota pumping.....	\$714,175.43
Oklahoma.....	Lawton.....	190,000.00
Oregon.....	Umatilla.....	3,841,324.78
Do.....	Oregon cooperative work.....	5,500,000.00
Oregon-California.....	Klamath.....	4,331,756.55
South Dakota.....	Bellefourche.....	3,533,081.43
Utah.....	Strawberry Valley.....	3,407,000.00
Washington.....	Okanogan.....	888,543.88
Do.....	Yakima (including Storage, Sunnyside, and Tieton).....	13,049,157.92
Wyoming.....	Shoshone.....	9,452,000.00
Total.....		149,051,407.05

¹ This does not include the cost of operation and maintenance during construction, the earnings of which are estimated to equal the cost.

² Does not include construction of E. and W. Bottom, Williston; upper and lower Bottom, Buford; canal extension "A" Buford; and Trenton Flat.

³ Amount allotted for cooperation work with the State of Oregon. No data in office showing the estimated completed cost.

Balance sheet showing financial conditions on Apr. 30, 1914, of project accounts.

Projects.	Assets.					
	Net cost of project.		Inventory of stock on hand.	Accounts receivable.		
	Building.	Operation and maintenance.		W. R. building charges.	W. R. O. and M. charges.	Miscellaneous.
Arizona, Salt River.....	\$9,931,205.42		\$212,433.51			\$59,318.16
Arizona-California, Yuma.....	6,416,557.46	\$189,036.98	307,754.82	\$128,014.42	\$18,391.32	3,324.49
California, Orland.....	607,471.14		13,693.47			46.97
Colorado, Grand Valley.....	997,901.27		67,535.71			445.50
Colorado, Uncompahgre.....	5,292,361.97		83,825.13			1,240.00
Idaho, Boise.....	8,995,671.94		330,924.22			18,494.40
Idaho, Minidoka.....	4,309,346.00	836,443.81	134,884.28	53,198.73	72,199.20	150,483.34
Kansas, Garden City.....	374,502.68		5,684.07			
Montana, Huntley.....	1,134,037.28	166,231.63	28,477.09	78,974.49	17,693.76	121.39
Montana, Milk River.....	1,690,394.17		73,906.42			845.69
Montana, St. Mary storage.....	656,495.56		110,392.06			7,982.04
Montana, Sun River.....	1,303,900.32	65,168.25	146,897.93	73,932.77	12,686.34	33.50
Montana-North Dakota, Lower Yellowstone.....	2,821,969.42	402,187.04	34,771.16	44,008.47	127,359.76	52.50
Nebraska-Wyoming, North Platte.....	6,176,879.77	274,265.35	120,029.08	325,745.95	111,883.45	
Nevada, Truckee-Carson.....	5,373,723.34	286,658.52	126,710.34	68,429.04	4,451.23	575.89
New Mexico, Carlsbad.....	876,472.49	115,501.73	17,090.07	43,446.70	4,637.50	
New Mexico, Hondo.....	361,246.58		610.05			103.93
New Mexico-Texas, Rio Grande.....	731,022.13		39,938.08			
New Mexico-Texas, Elephant Butte storage.....	1,662,371.22		300,279.81			43.55
New Mexico-Texas, Rio Grande Dam appropriation.....	1,000,000.00					
North Dakota, North Dakota pumping.....	695,483.81	238,037.48	15,365.56	74,535.51	34,082.76	1,500.00
Oklahoma, Lawton.....	109.88					
Oregon, Umatilla.....	1,469,300.25	176,385.93	35,940.44	150,477.88	23,849.92	304.22
Oregon-California, Klamath.....	2,379,217.68	150,911.80	45,263.15	60,427.00	788.62	537.75

Balance sheet showing financial conditions on Apr. 30, 1914, of project accounts—Continued.

Projects.	Assets.					
	Net cost of project.		Inventory of stock on hand.	Accounts receivable.		
	Building.	Operation and maintenance.		W. R. building charges.	W. R. O. and M. charges.	Miscellaneous.
South Dakota, Bellefourche.....	\$3,128,249.02	\$222,272.08	\$52,500.84	\$167,220.00	\$11,276.63	\$199.20
Utah, Strawberry Valley.....	2,285,139.24		73,197.06			1,124.71
Washington, Okanogan.....	602,697.16	62,000.00	9,000.00	52,387.70		1,368.00
Washington, Yakima-Storage.....	1,128,774.07		203,122.35			35,537.59
Washington, Yakima-Sunnyside.....	2,335,428.69	471,832.02	23,035.04	230,618.30	19,830.88	12,469.99
Washington, Yakima-Tieton.....	2,963,842.11	114,850.22	26,040.69	218,863.48	20,856.02	51,095.05
Wyoming, Shoshone.....	4,010,772.83	118,921.44	90,555.64	127,126.04	7,934.66	10,656.02
Preliminary investigations.....	80,488.73					
Secondary projects.....	774,456.94		90,003.30			157.81
Jackson Lake enlargement.....			93,669.45			111,372.55
General expenses.....			60,019.26			78.05
Indian projects:						
Montana, Blackfeet.....	6,166.17		39,796.10			9,074.43
Montana, Flathead.....	8,616.66		104,088.80			69,231.62
Montana, Fort Peck.....	300.83		38,541.56			7,807.18
Total.....	82,581,673.61	3,890,704.28	3,078,011.54	\$1,897,406.48	\$517,902.05	332,880.33

Projects.	Liabilities.							Net investment of the United States.
	Accounts payable.	Water-right repayment accruals.						
		Building charges.			O. and M. charges.			
		Accrued.	Forfeited.	Advanced.	Accrued.	Forfeited.	Advanced.	
Arizona, Salt River.....	\$39,056.73	\$100,000.00						\$10,063,905.36
Arizona-California, Yuma.....	130,341.73	269,530.18	\$754.00	\$617.50	\$62,445.70	\$251.00	\$8.17	6,599,131.21
California, Orland.....	9,381.41							611,830.17
Colorado, Grand Valley.....	78,447.39							987,435.09
Colorado, Uncompahgre.....	31,641.63							5,345,785.47
Idaho, Boise.....	222,647.78							9,122,442.78
Idaho, Minidoka.....	73,244.13	402,462.80	6,667.78	96,846.27	365,703.90	1,687.49	905.01	4,609,037.95
Kansas, Garden City.....	3,715.46							376,471.29
Montana, Huntley.....	20,066.66	308,827.88	3,289.68	5,873.37	84,942.91	851.23	9.75	1,001,674.16
Montana, Milk River.....	89,469.42							1,675,676.88
Montana, St. Mary storage.....	40,365.66							734,504.00
Montana, Sun River.....	89,669.14	163,437.47	1,264.53	278.63	41,865.28	211.88	63.60	1,305,828.60
Montana-North Dakota, Lower Yellowstone.....	34,767.57	51,272.59	255.00	26,138.95	162,546.34	95.50	380.00	3,153,992.40
Nebraska-Wyoming, North Platte.....	56,976.89	501,479.43	3,539.70	4,102.80	344,339.17	871.55	370.59	6,097,123.47
Nevada, Truckee-Carson.....	65,088.04	304,961.13	1,317.80	1,693.65	144,562.12	1,275.07	175.94	5,341,474.61
New Mexico, Carlsbad.....	5,683.76	114,026.80	108.50	39,922.60	115,757.45	85.95	714.24	780,849.19
New Mexico, Hondo.....	229.31							361,731.25
New Mexico-Texas, Rio Grande.....	13,283.05							757,677.16
New Mexico-Texas, Elephant Butte storage.....	175,549.49							1,787,145.09
New Mexico-Texas, Rio Grande Dam appropriation.....								1,000,000.00
North Dakota, North Dakota pumping.....	3,760.29	80,883.54	152.00	30.40	46,654.36	74.70	.40	927,429.43
Oklahoma, Lawton.....								109.88
Oregon, Umatilla.....	12,375.41	307,448.22	1,371.22	28,380.10	75,296.83	390.53	6,511.38	1,427,504.95
Oregon-California, Klamath.....	16,733.51	318,394.00	9.00	4,543.00	99,197.25	3.75	8,341.13	2,189,923.74
South Dakota, Bellefourche.....	95,679.89	273,097.56	588.00	936.00	129,629.65	180.40		3,111,606.27
Utah, Strawberry Valley.....	31,388.42							2,328,072.59
Washington, Okanogan.....	5,500.00	68,228.40		130.00	34,566.87			619,027.59
Washington, Yakima-Storage.....	36,759.53							1,330,674.48
Washington, Yakima-Sunnyside.....	11,208.97	811,789.45		5,819.15	446,931.55		512.11	1,816,913.60
Washington, Yakima-Tieton.....	14,726.97	406,968.59		2,020.11	128,982.08	3.00	178.50	2,842,668.32
Wyoming, Shoshone.....	26,556.56	329,900.99	2,101.94	2,805.21	89,621.96	1,480.61	692.46	3,912,806.90
Preliminary investigations.....								80,488.73
Secondary projects.....	1,673.97							781,944.08
Jackson Lake enlargement.....	16,565.85							34,268.95
General expenses.....	12,547.05							47,550.23
INDIAN PROJECTS.								
Montana, Blackfeet.....	6,074.21							48,962.49
Montana, Flathead.....	21,584.38							159,032.70
Montana, Fort Peck.....	9,170.08							37,479.49
Total.....	1,502,420.34	\$4,812,709.03	21,419.15	220,117.74	2,373,043.42	7,462.64	18,863.31	83,342,542.66

¹ Advance receipts. ² This is balance now due on building. ³ This is balance now due in O. & M. ⁴ Credit balance. ⁵ This is total, both due and paid on building.

praiseworthy effort of redeeming the waste places. It will give heart to the settlers and induce occupation of available lands, and, instead of delaying the progress of irrigation, will result in increased returns to the reclamation fund and correspondingly provide the means for future expansion and development. It is farthest from my purpose to inject into my remarks anything that might have a political flavor, and yet I feel constrained to invite attention to some of the conditions which now confront the husbandman in the West and which will become more acute with the increase of agricultural products. We are far removed from the great waterways and marts of the East. The great distances to be covered and the heavy expense of transportation by rail compel the farmer to rely largely on the home market or restrict his operations to producing that which can bear a heavy freight charge. Many sections of the West

where irrigation is necessary have been found splendidly adapted to the production of sugar beets.

The beet-sugar industry has proved a blessing to the people wherever it has been established, and under fair and favorable conditions will make rapid growth and expansion. Sugar-beet culture necessarily increases the opportunity for healthful employment for boys, and inculcates in them habits of industry, so essential to future success. It results in improved and better cultivation of the soil, by which the land is brought to a high state of fertility. It is a ready-money crop, and enters into competition with no other product of the soil; but, on the contrary, every acre devoted to the sugar-beet culture is removed from competition with other crops and contributes to making a market for them. We have embarked upon the reclamation policy, and have spent millions in constructing irrigation works.

and many more millions will be expended in the rotation scheme provided. We are interested in smoothing the rugged pathway of the desert pioneer, as evidenced by this bill; but the most substantial, enduring, and effective help we can give is to open to him the opportunity of utilizing his lands to the best advantage in the production of the most valuable crops. The products taken from the soil largely go out in exchange for the products of other American labor. The sugar thus produced, in addition to making us independent for a necessary food supply, is exchanged for other American products, and simply results, in its final analysis, to an exchange of labor between American producers.

I am pleased to know that the importance of the sugar industry has at last dawned upon the present administration and that an investigation of it has been undertaken. It is so important an industry, and fraught with such manifest, direct, and indirect benefits that it is cruel and inexcusable to make it the football of politics. From the standpoint of our agricultural development and national welfare, an industry so admirably adapted to our soil and climate and so necessary to our food supply ought to be permitted to live and expand. And all that is asked is that the toilers who are engaged in it shall be given the consideration of other producers who compete against the paltry paid labor of other countries. The sugar industry ought not to be regarded as a political asset. We should approach its consideration on the broad principle of our national welfare, and take a common-sense, practical course to insure its reestablishment, extension, and permanency as a great auxiliary to our matchless agricultural production.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, we have spent the entire day on this matter of interest. The unspeakable agony some of these gentlemen have evinced because the settlers on these reclamation projects are not able to redeem the agreements they have made is enough to bring tears to the eyes of the stanchest and most stalwart. Here comes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEX], who is justly proud of the fact that he is the owner of a 1,900-acre farm in Illinois. They say land is worth about \$250 per acre down there, so here you have better than a half-million-dollar farm. I know the gentleman obeyed the law in acquiring that farm, but that he derived the lucky dog's advantage of rotten laws I would risk a wager. He thinks we should compel these western settlers on these reclamation projects to settle up in the 10 years allowed or else pay a penalty of 3 per cent per annum, which he calls interest.

Why did they not put interest in the original act? Because interest did not belong there. There were men then in Congress that knocked the West and those who were settling the West, but Congress would not think then of interest. Then it was considered a splendid policy to get men with families onto these lands that were arid and utterly worthless. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader of the Republican minority, who is leading the fight for interest here to-day, recently mentioned in debate the fact that when this reclamation bill was being first considered some Member had made a forceful speech against it and he had advised him not to put that speech in the RECORD, for if he did, "it would live hereafter to plague him." The advice was followed, and later this very man was praised for helping out the cause of reclamation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was for the bill then. He did not vote against the bill because 10 years were to go by without interest. If it was right then, is there any logic in declaring it wrong now—assess a 3 per cent penalty on these people for not meeting the payments promptly?

Every man who thinks knows that the land laws are wrong in this country. We want to encourage small farms and discourage absentee landlordism. The gentleman who owns his 1,900-acre farm in Illinois and collects dividends from it may have a good farm—I hope he has—but it would be better if such areas were broken up into smaller tracts and more families were given a chance. That is what the Reclamation Service is doing.

I am not going to plead for these people as "poor devils" or any other kind of unfortunates here seeking charity. The Reclamation Service is one of the very first of the activities of this Government in efficiency and accomplishment. It has scored a rousing and a wonderful success, and the people out there may have been poor devils when they lived in Chicago and Philadelphia, but now they have their eyes turned toward the light; hope is in their hearts and buoyancy in their step.

They have fought a hard fight, and there is tremendous work ahead. They left the tenement behind them, and, with overworked wife and children with sallow complexions, they settled out there to have a home. They have worked hard, and they will keep on working. Little towns have sprung up in every direction. There are 14,000 farmers. With their fam-

ilies and their hands there are 140,000 of them engaged in the farming, but that does not limit their activity. There are canning factories and machine and repair shops, stores, farming-implement agencies, sawmills to supply lumber, doctors, lawyers, nurses, newspapers, book dealers, churches and preachers, schools and school-teachers—oh, there are a thousand activities.

Let these knockers that call these men who settle out there fools rear up here on their hind legs and chatter and gibber all they want, but the people of this country are back of those reclamation projects, and the settlers out there know they will get a square deal. Is not the country richer by having those beautiful little enterprising cities on these arid plains rather than to have blinding sands to blow into the faces of the tourists as they pass through those vast areas? Can not you gentlemen see any advantage to the public and gain to the Treasury? Is not the corporation tax increased and the incomes enlarged for the purposes of taxation? The railroads are stimulated to spend large sums for betterments.

I shall say some more a little later about the Reclamation Service itself and its officials. Too much can not be said in their praise for their splendid accomplishments; but let me say now some more about these settlers and their problems. The Government's investment is about \$80,000,000.

The lands are not nearly all settled, owing mainly to the fact that interest sharks have prevented this Government from pursuing a liberal enough policy to hold those who would have filled up the lists, but who have gone to Canada, where the settler can borrow money to help him along. In Australia the Government lends a settler who will spend \$1,000 on his place \$600 in cash. They think a citizen and a farmer with his family producing wealth is worth something, but there are some on this floor who do not seem to think such an asset is worth 3 cents.

The settler on one of these little farms has a tremendous job ahead of him. If everything goes well and nothing unexpected happens, he must ditch and drain and build. He must have horses and feed them, poultry, farm animals. He must grade and level and plow. He must buy lumber and implements. Expense at every turn. Then he must pay the Government for the water he gets in the way of operating expenses. He has no title to his land, for a tremendous mortgage is on it for the full amount of the Government's investment. Then he has to buy seed and trees and plant his crop and suffer losses till he learns from experience just how to proceed. He may lose part of his crop for mistakes about drainage, or his money may have given out and he lost because he was denied things that he very badly needed. He had underestimated his crop—an invariable feature in every line of endeavor.

I am unable to understand why men on this floor will refuse to appreciate these facts and will not see the asset the Government has in an enterprise of this kind. We are to get every cent of it back, dollar for dollar. It is public-lands money put into a revolving fund. But now that the settler asks for time, you say, "Yes; give them time, but we must have interest."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], palms up, says, "Pisness is pisness. This can give time, but we need the interest." Yet he nearly talked himself into utter exhaustion to try to force through here a scheme to get the Government to buy a lot of waste lands in Philadelphia, near a powder plant, which was worthless almost and was not needed and yet to cost a very large sum. He takes relays with other gentlemen here in pleading for "protection for the infant industries of Pennsylvania." He wants the Government to take from the people a sum of money to swell the profits of every trust-owned factory in his State—the infant industry known as the Steel Trust, the textile mills, and the shipping plants. He did not mind helping the ships with free tolls, but a farmer on the reclaimed arid plains of the West, making an American home, creating wealth, bringing up citizens who will fight for the flag when called, are not worth 3 cents. "Pisness is pisness."

The millions they do not collect for the Government but let trusts absorb through unconscionably high tariffs never come back to the people. I believe in a big Navy, but I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] making an argument for a big Navy with which I can not agree. He said the building of a ship was justified because the spending of the money by the Government put it into circulation and created work; yet he sees nothing of this kind in the reclamation work, notwithstanding the fact that every dollar is to come back, the Government holding title to everything till every cent is paid. Is there any other expenditure the Government makes that will ever come back? They talk about their lands, but the Government has lost title to them, and of course we can not take them up in great reclamation projects.

They are behind in their arguments on this subject. The Government does not ask interest on its post-office investments, its public buildings; all it asks of the Post Office Department is to pay expenses. Profit is all some men can get into their heads, but the Government is not looking for the kind of profits they talk about here to-day. These tremendous plants out there were necessary to make the lands fit for homestead.

The great forest reserves are not operated for profit. The reserved coal does not bear dividends. When we develop fully the system to use the forests and the coal all the Government wants is cost price.

U. S. does not stand for Uncle Shylock.

If we ever do get enough honorable energy into this House to reserve the radium deposits from private control, we will not do that for profits. We did not build the Alaska railroad for profits. We will be satisfied to get cost of operation and a small part each year on the investment. The Government one day will own all the railroads. I suppose these Uncle Shylock patriots will expect the Government to get 3 per cent on \$20,000,000 for dividends like the Goulds, the Vanderbilts, and the Morgans—nearly two millions a day that would be. That is not the plan at all, and it is time the Uncle Shylocks came to themselves.

Now, as to the Reclamation Service, that work has been splendidly done.

The estimates as originally and roughly made for projects during the period of reconnaissance have no bearing, as they did not obligate the Government to construct anything. I understand that the estimated cost contemplated by law, as announced by the Secretary of the Interior when a project is formally opened, has not greatly exceeded the amount originally anticipated in those projects which were built in accordance with the original plans. On the Salt River project in Arizona the original expenditure contemplated was about \$4,000,000. After the work began the people urged the Secretary to modify the plans by increasing the height of the Roosevelt Dam, by developing power, by constructing a million-dollar diversion dam, and by purchasing and enlarging a number of the old canal systems. The investment now is \$10,500,000. The estimated cost of the work originally planned is very close to the actual cost of construction. Nearly every one of the larger projects shows similar expansions and alterations, most of which were ordered by the Secretary of the Interior in response to urgent requests of the landowners.

In planning the projects of the Reclamation Service it was assumed in the estimates that the Government would construct the reservoirs and the main canals, leaving to the farmers the building of the distribution systems, as has been practiced on many of the earlier private irrigation systems. Inasmuch as the distribution systems in irrigation projects cost from \$10 to \$20 per acre, the adding of the construction of distribution systems to the original plans for the various projects in which this was not included in the original estimate has increased the cost of those projects from \$10 to \$20 per acre. Where a portion of the distribution system only was planned for and afterwards a complete distribution system was built, the cost per acre has been proportionately increased. The fact that these distribution systems have been built does not mean that the work has been performed extravagantly, but merely means that the water user has been furnished a more complete irrigation system than it was originally planned he should have.

So far as the principal projects of the Reclamation Service are concerned, they were largely planned and estimates of their costs made during 1903 and 1904. As I have already shown, the price of labor at this time was considerably lower than it was during the succeeding years. It is well known that labor was cheaper during 1903 and 1904 than during 1905 and succeeding years. Records of the Reclamation Service show that the average rate of wages on the projects under construction by the Reclamation Service in 1906 was 18 per cent higher than in 1905, and in 1907 was 20 per cent higher than in 1905, and these increases would be still more compared with 1903 and 1904. The bulk of the work on the principal projects of the Reclamation Service on which estimates were made during 1903 and 1904 was done in 1905 and later.

In addition to the increase in cost of labor during 1906-1908 there was so much construction work in progress throughout the country that it was very difficult to obtain laborers, and the efficiency of labor greatly decreased. I have been informed that in many cases it was only possible to secure the most transient labor. Knowing that they could get work anywhere this class of men did not care to hold a permanent job. A construction company that has a continuous organization did not feel the effects of this inefficiency so much, but all temporary construction work requiring the labor of men for a short time

in one place had great difficulty in retaining men, and for trivial reasons the men would often quit in a body and greatly embarrass the work. In the reclamation work a number of cases could be cited where carloads of laborers were shipped from Chicago, the home of these gentlemen who are now opposing us, or eastern points—New York City, for instance—by the railroads for the Reclamation Service, and they all deserted before they got to the site of the work. These difficulties not only greatly hampered the work of the service, but so reduced the efficiency as to add greatly to its cost. In many cases the depreciation in efficiency of the laborers resulted in from 25 to 30 per cent of additional cost.

There were also increases in the costs of some of the principal construction materials during the years 1906, 1907, and 1908 over the costs during 1903 and 1904, which tended to increase the actual costs appreciably over the estimated costs.

There is another element that enters into the cost of construction work on an irrigation project and that quite generally causes an increase of cost. This is the rise in the price of forage and grain used for animals employed and the cost of animals themselves. In the majority of cases the price of hay and grain was doubled during the construction period following the dates in which the estimates of the projects were made. A similar increase in the cost of horses and mules existed. These rises in prices of feed and work animals are generally due to the sudden increased demand for these products beyond the capacity of the local supplies.

The underestimating of the cost of engineering works is not peculiar to the Reclamation Service. A similar condition exists in the construction of private irrigation works. It is well known that railway work, private irrigation work, and work on the Panama Canal were all being done at from 60 to 75 per cent in excess of what the cost was, or would have been, estimated in 1904 or 1905.

The president of the Northern Pacific Railway states that the average cost of work prosecuted by that company since 1905 has been found by careful estimate to average about 60 per cent above the cost of the five years preceding that date. Mr. Andrew J. Wiley, Boise, Idaho, who has probably the widest experience with irrigation work under private enterprise and the provisions of the Carey Act during the last 10 years, states that his experience indicates the average cost since 1905 to be about 75 per cent more than the cost for the five years preceding that date. This testimony is borne out by the experience of all those engaged in construction work in the West as well, also, as in a less degree in other regions.

The estimated cost of the Panama Canal was \$149,000,000, and the cost to date is about \$400,000,000, showing increase of about 170 per cent. The canal is not yet completed, either. A portion of this is due to changes and extensions in plans as in the reclamation work and the remainder to the increased cost of labor.

It would appear, therefore, that the underestimation of cost of the work of the Reclamation Service is due principally to the increasing of the amount of work that was contemplated would be done on the projects, to an increased cost in labor between the time of making the estimate and the doing of the bulk of the work on the projects, to a similar but less increased cost of construction materials entering into the works during their construction, and to high prices for feed for stock used in the works. Such underestimation of costs can not therefore properly be adduced as an argument against the Federal Government engaged in large construction work.

The great difficulty in making comparison between private and Government work in the irrigation business is due to the fact that there is a multiplicity of conditions surrounding each project affecting the cost thereof that are not always considered when the comparisons are made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "three" in the last line and insert "one," so that the amendment as amended will read: "At the rate of 1 per cent per annum."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEVY. I call up my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York calls up his amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out "three" on the last line and inserting "four."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out "three" and inserting a zero.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GORDON. Such an amendment as that is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order if the gentleman desires to make it. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman write in there the word "zero"?

Mr. BRYAN. I will withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 51, noes 55.

Mr. COX. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. Cox and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 52, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 16, by inserting, after the word "established," the following: "In addition to the principal of the construction charge there shall be paid in each case annual interest upon the balance of the construction charge remaining unpaid at the rate of 2 per cent per annum."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRYAN. I make the point of order that that amendment is out of order, we having just refused to make a 3 per cent amendment and a 1 per cent amendment, and we can not now amend on the same identical point. The action of the House is conclusive.

Mr. MANN. This is new Progressive parliamentary law. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is that the debate on this amendment was closed and that all amendments were to be offered and voted on.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That was the unanimous-consent request as to all amendments but this one.

Mr. MANN. That was not the request at all. It was on all amendments and amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the request put to the Chair on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] and all amendments thereto—that the debate should close in one hour.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. It does not need to be renewed, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] argued with the Chair almost a day in trying to get an amendment changed after it was acted upon by the House, and the present Speaker, Mr. CLARK, ruled it out of order on the ground that we could not again take up the same subject matter.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the gentleman, of course.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN], who was so completely nonplussed by a temporary victory in the House, has reversed his ideas, and thinks that an amendment was just agreed to and can not be changed, and, with a learning that is worthy of great hearing, he has argued to the Chair that where the House has agreed to an amendment it can not change it. The gentleman imagines that the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the Chair has ruled that the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that the amendment is in order.

Mr. GARNER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. We have a lot of other amendments.

Mr. GARNER. What other amendments have you got? I will ask, Mr. Chairman, that on this particular amendment the debate close in 10 minutes. This matter has been discussed all afternoon. Let us try to get along with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] objects.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we are confronted with this proposition: The Government is expending \$200,000,000 for the development of arid lands. The question arises whether or not this Congress will decide that we ought to enter upon the expenditure of that money. If we agree in advance that the projects are unprofitable, surely we can not justify the expenditure of \$200,000,000 without some interest charge to those who get the benefit of that money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How does the gentleman get his \$200,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. I have stated that in detail.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. There has been and is now a sentiment all over the Nation in favor of rural credit legislation, and I would like to ask the gentlemen on this floor how you are going to justify the refusal to enact rural credit legislation for the farmers of the United States in the face of the expenditure of this \$200,000,000 for the development of the arid lands of the West without the payment of a single dollar of interest? If you establish this precedent now, you will be confronted with it when the rural credit legislation comes up for consideration before you. When the farmers of America demand of you equal treatment with those who live on the arid lands what can you say to them? What can you say to them when they confront you with the proposition that they want money out of the Public Treasury without the payment of interest when you have already decided to grant to those men who live on farms in the Western States \$200,000,000 for the development of their lands without the payment of a single dollar of interest? The Government of the United States issues its bonds, with the circulation privilege, at 2 per cent interest, but no Government bond has ever been issued at that interest rate without the circulation privilege. Why, then, grant the privilege to settlers on arid lands the use of public money payable in 20 years without any interest whatsoever?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well now, that will not work.

Mr. GARNER. I think this paragraph has been discussed the entire afternoon.

Mr. MANN. I notify the gentleman now that we had an understanding that there should be liberal debate on this, and there are some other amendments to this paragraph, and no one will make anything, so far as time is concerned, by breaking faith by a motion like this.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman understands that I have no desire to cut off debate.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the gentleman is coming in for. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is in charge of the bill.

Mr. GARNER. We have discussed this matter for hours; and I asked unanimous consent that the debate close in 10 minutes, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] objected.

Mr. MANN. Nobody is objecting to closing debate on this amendment.

Mr. GARNER. But objection was made.

Mr. MANN. Why should the gentleman from Texas make such a motion? The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is in charge of the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Is the gentleman from Illinois in charge of it on that side?

Mr. MANN. No; I am not in charge of it on either side, nor do I ever make such a motion as this, butting in, either.

Mr. GARNER. Why did the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] object? Is he in charge of the bill?

Mr. MANN. He has a right to object.

Mr. GARNER. I move that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. There will be no more business done in this House at any time without a quorum if this motion prevails.

Mr. GARNER. Of course the gentleman from Illinois can make his bluff.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman can call the bluff by going ahead and forcing the motion.

Mr. GARNER. I ask that the debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent, or make the motion?

Mr. GARNER. I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to know if it is going to be in order, after this amendment is voted on, for somebody else to move 1½ per cent, and then 5 per cent, and then 6 per cent, and then 8 per cent, or any other amount, and keep it up indefinitely?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to answer that question when we come to it. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take any time on this bill, but I do want to make a suggestion to the committee, and that is that we have had this one particular paragraph and this one particular question under discussion for the entire afternoon, and it does seem to me that there ought to be some limit somewhere when we can wind up this bill at some time.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARNER. I always yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. What need is there of hurry as to the business of the House? We are literally doing next to nothing, and liable to be doing that same thing until next December. Why does the gentleman get so impatient, and why is he in such a hurry to close debate?

Mr. LEVY. I will tell the gentleman why.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order. If we are to expedite business, let us expedite it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed.

Mr. MANN. I thought the gentleman from Texas asked unanimous consent to close debate at once.

Mr. GARNER. I did not; I asked to close debate in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Why not close it at once? You are wasting time.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Illinois wastes fifty minutes where I waste one.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not waste it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen are out of order.

Mr. GARNER. If the Chair does not care for me to address my remarks to the gentleman from Illinois, I will not do so. I want to call the attention of the committee, if the gentleman from Illinois will permit, to the fact that we have been on this one paragraph the entire afternoon, and while the gentleman from Illinois has enlightened the committee on the proposition, it is evident that his purpose is to inject all the politics into it he can, and at the same time do all the injury he can to the dry farmers of the West.

Mr. MANN. That is not true; it is a false statement.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Illinois will sit in his seat and violate the rules as he usually does.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is out of order.

Mr. GARNER. Unless the gentleman from Illinois can have the courtesy to get up and address the Chair and ask to be recognized—

Mr. MANN. Which I did not do.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Illinois seldom does; he is always invoking the rule, but violates it more than any Member on the floor.

Mr. MANN. I can take care of myself, notwithstanding the remarks of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Illinois is always agreeable if you let him have his way. Unfortunately under the rules governing the House he will have his way or take up the entire session to accomplish what he wants to accomplish. Often in the committee and in the House the gentleman from Illinois says that unless you agree to my whim I will make the point of no quorum and have the roll called.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not talking to his motion to expedite business.

Mr. GARNER. I hope the gentleman will content himself for a moment. I was discussing the amendment in connection with the fact that we have been considering the entire afternoon, and expressing the hope that I could with the aid of the gentleman from Illinois get through with the business.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota rose.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Texas desires to expedite the bill, and will he not make a motion to close debate in five minutes?

Mr. GARNER. I have asked unanimous consent to close debate in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman has wasted the five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the amendment by unanimous consent was to close in five minutes, and the gentleman from Texas has used a part of it.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for five minutes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas got the consent of the House to close debate in five minutes. I am entirely willing to have a vote now on this amendment. He has consumed the time, now let us vote.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, can we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by making it 2½ per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to amend the amendment by striking out the word "two" and inserting the words "two and a half." The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were 50 ayes and 63 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 3, by striking out all after the word "installment" down to the end of line 7, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and shall pay the balance of the principal of said construction charge in 20 annual installments, the first 5 of which shall each be 3 per cent of the construction charge, the next 10 installments shall each be 5 per cent, and the remaining 5 installments shall each be 6 per cent until the whole amount shall have been paid."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that this amendment provides much easier terms of payment than the original bill does, and if the gentlemen who are in favor of this irrigation proposition want to help the settlers, they should vote for this amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee I want to say that the officials of the Reclamation Service and the Interior Department, and the Irrigation Committees of both the Senate and the House, and nearly all the Members of the Senate and House from the West, as well as the representatives of all of these 32 reclamation projects, have been at work on this bill for a year or more and have exhaustively considered every line of it, and we are confident that this is the fairest and most practical and best way of making these payments, both for the Government and the settlers under these projects, and I hope this system will be retained in the bill, and that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 2, by striking out all after the word "two" down to the end of line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "5 per cent of the construction charge fixed for his land as an initial installment, and shall pay the balance of the principal of said charge in 35 annual installments, the first 10 of which shall each be 2 per cent of the construction charge and the remaining 25 shall each be 3 per cent, until the whole amount shall have been paid. In addition to the principal of the construction charge there shall be paid in each case, annually, interest upon the balance of the construction charge remaining unpaid from time to time at the rate of 3 per cent per annum."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment gives to the people who live on these irrigation projects 35 years in which to make payments. Each annual payment is so small that it can not involve any hardship whatever to the settler. The chairman of the committee says that he and others have given six months' time to the consideration of this bill; that they have decided upon just exactly what is to be done; that they have reached a conclusion that is most beneficial to the settlers on the arid lands of the West; and they are in favor of imposing burdens upon the arid-land settlers that this amendment does not impose. They want him to make his payments within 20 years, and I am willing to give him 35 years in which to make his payments. If you want to help the settler on the arid western land, you will vote for the adoption of this amendment, because it proposes to lighten his burdens; it proposes to give him time in which to make his payments, and makes the payments so light that nobody can complain.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the amendment. Under the existing law the payments are all to be made within 10 years' time. Under the bill which is now pending on entries hereafter made the entryman pays 5 per cent at the beginning and pays nothing more until 5 years, and then pays the balance in different amounts in 15 years, making the whole amount payable within 20 years' time. The amendment which has been offered by my colleague makes no change except to extend the time from 20 years to 40 years, and provides for an interest charge of 3 per cent. It would still leave no payment of the principal of the construction charge for 5 years, except the initial payment of 5 per cent, and would in no case require the payment for principal and interest combined to be more than 5 per cent per annum upon the amount invested. How can gentlemen object to that? They would only be required under this amendment to pay 2 per cent of the construction charge during the second 5 years. It would amount to a total of 10 per cent of the construction charge after the initial payment during the first 10 years. How can gentlemen have the nerve, when they borrow money from the Federal Treasury, not to be willing to pay for principal and interest 5 per cent a year and thereby pay off the principal? Gentlemen are now sowing the wind, but they will reap the whirlwind. Those in these arid regions will find that a Congress hereafter will some time say, "You have gone too far," and they will pull back, and gentlemen from the other portions of the country who go home this summer and say, "There has been no rural credit bill passed under which you farmers can obtain any help, with the payment of interest, yet I voted for a bill to give to other farmers money without interest, and even refused to vote for a proposition which would retire both the principal and the interest in 40 years' time, with no payment in any year exceeding 5 per cent of the loan," will reap the whirlwind next fall.

The gentlemen ought to be willing to accept it, but they have had their hand in the Treasury so easy that they are unwilling to withdraw it unless it is filled with money. I wish gentlemen were willing to accept a reasonable proposition. Wherever the Government, as it has in some places in the world, has undertaken to help the farmers by the advancement of money, it never has made a proposition more generous to the farmers than the one from my colleague now pending.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. For a question.

Mr. BRYAN. I have before me a report on the speech of Mr. Elwood Meade on reclamation projects in Australia, which entirely contradicts the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MANN. What is it about?

Mr. BRYAN. It is about reclamation.

Mr. MANN. Does it relate to this subject?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. That is rather unusual—

Mr. BRYAN. And in addition to furnishing water and what has been done in this country, they make a cash loan of 60 per cent of the settlers' improvements in Australia, and they have more liberal privileges in Canada.

Mr. MANN. They loan that 60 per cent at interest.

Mr. BRYAN. They do not charge—

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman has nerve to offer that as a precedent for loaning them 100 per cent without interest. Great God!

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman is mistaken; they charge nothing on the work, but interest on the loan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask to be recognized.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Under the five-minute rule there can only be one speech for and one against the proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. No one has been recognized against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we have all of us long since been warned to beware of the Greeks bearing gifts. [Applause.] It is always safe to vote against an amendment offered by the enemy of a proposition. The gentleman from Illinois, who offered this amendment, would be happy if there was an interest charge and has voted for interest amendments. Here is an amendment now that no man can justify, because of the fact that it extends the period of payment to 35 years and lays a heavy burden of interest—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Whereas no settler on any reclamation project, no dweller in the country where the reclamation projects are being undertaken, no one having to do with reclamation projects has ever asked for any extension beyond 20 years, and I prefer to take the period which the friends of the measure have decided is fair and equitable rather than this proposed by the enemy.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is not all debate exhausted on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I have had long experience in listing and selling farm lands. I have acquired a knowledge of conditions in the arid regions from personal experience. I know perfectly well that what the settler needs to make good is time to pay for his land out of its product. He does not need to be coddled, and he does not need to get along without the payment of interest, which he always pays under every private contract. What he needs is time to work out his own salvation. I have sold a great deal of land, and I have never taken back one acre from any settler. I have always realized that when he has met with adversity, then I ought to give him a chance by extending his time and not by curtailing a low interest charge.

The same thing must be true and will be proven true in Government ownership and Government transfers. I can not see why we should further subsidize the settlement of arid Government lands. We ought possibly, under our homestead policy, freely to give the land, but when through Government help we put water upon the land and make it productive when it was not productive, then it is but fair that we should ask the man who goes upon that land to make good the improvement charge, principal and interest.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENT. No; I shall not yield. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has put in an amendment that is eminently reasonable. It provides long, patient waiting of 35 years on the part of the Government, with payment of an extremely low rate of interest at 3 per cent. If we here and now abolish the idea of the Government charging interest on improvements put on land, I can not see how we can ever possibly face the proposition of granting or aiding rural credit without giving to all applicants the same privilege of money without interest that we give to these people on irrigation projects. And therefore, in the interest of the people whom I know, in the interest of my own district and all other agricultural districts, I believe that the granting of this long, long period is to their advantage, and I believe the Government will not be the loser, provided it make an interest charge. But if the Government here and now starts in to lend money for improvement of property without charging interest, we might just as well take upon ourselves every crazy scheme that Coxey or any other flatist ever urged, and go to it to an insolvent finish. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a great mistake that the friends of this bill do not agree upon a fair rate of

interest. It will be construed wrongfully, and you must take into consideration the financial situation of the country. It is not very easy at the present time to sell any 2 per cent bonds or 3 per cent bonds. The English Government receives 3 per cent for their land sales and purchases in Ireland. At the present time the securities of this country are selling on the basis of 8 and 10 per cent, and if you go on in the manner that you propose, expending \$200,000,000, how do you propose to keep the credit of the United States Government up to par? It is a great mistake. You should at least make it 3 or 4 per cent. I am quite sure that even the people in the section who ask for this extension will agree to it, because in that portion of the country money is demanding 8 to 10 per cent per annum. In Canada the railroads, in making improvements, receive 4 or 5 per cent for money on irrigation lands.

I hope the friends of this bill will reconsider it and come to the conclusion that we ought to charge some rate of interest. Otherwise this bill will be a failure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 30, noes 57.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado and Mr. MADDEN took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 38, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACT SHALL APPLY TO EXISTING PROJECTS.

Sec. 2. That any person whose land or entry has heretofore become subject to the terms and conditions of the reclamation law shall pay the construction charge, or the portion of the construction charge remaining unpaid, in 20 annual installments, the first of which shall become due and payable on December 1 of the year in which the public notice affecting his land is issued under this act, and subsequent installments on December 1 of each year thereafter. The first 4 of such installments shall each be 2 per cent, the next 2 installments shall each be 4 per cent, and the next 14 each 6 per cent of the total construction charge.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 3, line 4, after the word "charge," insert "or the portion of the construction charge unpaid at the beginning of such installments."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. That any person whose land or entry has heretofore become subject to the terms and conditions of the reclamation law shall pay the principal of the construction charge, or the portion of the principal of the construction charge remaining unpaid, in 40 annual installments, the first of which shall become due and payable on December 1 of the year in which the public notice affecting his land is issued under this act, and subsequent installments on December 1 of each year thereafter. The first 10 of such installments shall each be 1 per cent and the remaining 30 installments shall each be 3 per cent of the total construction charge, or the portion of the construction charge unpaid at the beginning of such installments: *Provided*, That in addition to the principal of the construction charge there shall be paid in each case, annually, interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum upon such portion of the balance of the construction charge as remains unpaid beyond the time or times fixed for the payment thereof under the reclamation law in force when such land or entry became subject to the terms and conditions of such reclamation law: *Provided further*, That such person may, if he so elects, pay the whole or any part of the construction charge owing by him prior to the time herein required."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. GARNER. Let us get through with this section and start in with the next section.

Mr. MADDEN. All right. I will withdraw my point.

Mr. MANN. We have just finished the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PENALTIES.

Sec. 3. That if any water-right applicant or entryman shall fail to pay any installment of his construction charges when due, there shall be added to the amount unpaid a penalty of 1 per cent thereof, and there shall be added a like penalty of 1 per cent of the amount unpaid on the first day of each month thereafter so long as such default shall continue. If any such applicant or entryman shall be one year in de-

fault in the payment of any installment of the construction charges and penalties, or any part thereof, his water-right application, and if he be a homestead entryman, his entry also shall be subject to cancellation, and all payments made by him forfeited to the reclamation fund, but no homestead entry shall be subject to contest because of such default: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Interior shall so elect, he may cause suit or action to be brought for the recovery of the amount in default and penalties; but if suit or action be brought, the right to declare a cancellation and forfeiture shall be suspended pending such suit or action.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 4628) extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8660. An act to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act granting a franchise for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a street railway system in the district of South Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii," approved August 1, 1912.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 5316. An act authorizing the survey and sale of certain lands in Coconino County, Ariz., to the occupants thereof;

S. 1087. An act authorizing the exchange of certain lands within the Fishlake National Forest, Utah;

S. 485. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911;

S. 5957. An act to authorize the Frost-Johnson Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across the Sabine River in the States of Louisiana and Texas, about 2 miles west of Hunter, La.; and

S. 785. An act to relinquish, release, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to certain lands in the State of Mississippi.

REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following personal requests, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAGGART requests leave of absence for 10 days, on account of important business.

Mr. STEENERSON requests leave of absence for 60 days, on account of public business.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee requests leave of absence indefinitely, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to these requests?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to all these requests, each and every one of them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] objects to all these requests.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Thursday, July 23, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KITCHIN, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12303) to amend section 3246 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 5 of the act of March 1, 1879, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1002), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10056) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Grand Junction, Colo., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1004), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 6031) authorizing the Board of Trade of Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., to construct a bridge across Sulphur River at or near Pace's ferry, between the counties of Bowie and Cass, in the State of Texas, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1005), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 571) requesting the Secretary of Commerce to report to the House all facts and information in his possession concerning the prices paid for wheat to the producer thereof in the State of Kansas and the prices at which said wheat is sold for export by dealers, concerns, and exporters at Kansas City, Mo., and how such prices are fixed and determined, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1006), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 18010) making copy of schedule of rates filed by carriers with the Interstate Commerce Commission admissible as primary evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 18011) to provide for the establishment of an additional life-saving station at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 18012) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Goeller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18013) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 18014) to correct the military record of Cornelius Hardin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTOR: A bill (H. R. 18015) granting a pension to James Tucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18016) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Olds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 18017) for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Burnett; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 18018) for the relief of Jesse P. Riffe; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18019) for the relief of John H. Engleman, administrator of the estate of John Engleman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 18020) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 18021) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Seitzinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 18022) reinstating J. I. Boyle to his former rank and grade in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 18023) granting an increase of pension to Conrad H. Rowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 18024) granting a pension to Celinda B. Coon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18025) granting a pension to Jane Calafier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 18026) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 18027) for the relief of John M. Henley; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 18028) granting a pension to Marion Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18029) granting an increase of pension to James M. Cooke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Kansas Investment Co., of Ness City, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of a number of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Southwestern Missouri Millers' Club, in favor of 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 59 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of 29 citizens of St. Louis County, Mo., in favor of House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Memorial of Headquarters Richard Allen Post, No. 65, Grand Army of the Republic, of Elyria, Ohio, favoring appropriation for reunion of veterans at Vicksburg, Miss., in 1915; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Wisconsin Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring the Stevens bill (H. R. 13305) relative to fixed selling price; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: Petitions for the Sheppard-Hobson amendment, as follows: Wallace County, Kans., 14 names; Lucas, Kans., 326 names; Norton County, Kans., 16 names; Formoso, Kans., 21 names; and Kanorado, Kans., 20 names; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petitions of citizens of Farina; members of Olney District Epworth League; Beulah Church, of Sumner; citizens of Walnut Hill; Grand C. E. of Robinson; Otterbein United Brethren Sunday School; citizens of Odin, Marion County; members of Sunday school of Kell; and 100 people of Kinmundy, all of the State of Illinois, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KONOP: Petitions of 300 citizens of Detroit Harbor and St. Paul's Methodist congregation of Green Bay, Wis., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of B. Emfry and others, of Beaver, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KORBLY: Petition of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Memorial of Smith Cavit Post, No. 299, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, favoring appropriation for reunion of veterans at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RUPLEY: Petition of Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, Philadelphia, and Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring postponement of trust legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lebanon County, Pa., against any change in United States flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Western Society of Engineers, Chicago, Ill., relative to H. R. 13457, providing for a more equitable distribution of topographic surveys, etc.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of representatives of four Young People's Societies of Vinita, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of A. N. Klein, J. B. Clark, and 34 others of Marietta, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 23, 1914.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of hosts, we thank Thee that we are called to serve in the army that is marching forward battling for the right. We thank Thee for our great Leader who bids us follow Him on to honor and to victory. We can not doubt the issues while Thou art leading the way. May we be true to Thee. May we be loyal to our great Commander; and, being inspired by the righteousness of our cause, may we be valiant in service. May we have courage, therefore, to meet all the demands that may be upon us this day. We ask it in the name of Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. NEWLANDS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of